

need, he declared, in an address before the Real Estate and Mortgage Forum of the Savings Bank Women of New York, held at the Park Sheraton Hotel.

Commissioner McMurray cited as factors contributing to the need the huge increase to be expected in the early 1960's in the number of new families to be formed by the post-World War II babies, the great backlog of unfulfilled need which increases each year, the increased incomes of families which will continue, the formation of larger sized families, earlier marriages among our population, undoubling, the additional units required as a result of slum clearance and housing demolition for roads and other purposes, and the formation of households other than families.

Commissioner McMurray pointed out that the Federal Reserve Board's annual report published last week on consumers' buying plans shows more people, 9.6 percent, expect to buy homes this year than in any year since 1948. In 1950 it was 8.4 percent, in 1954 it was 6.6 percent. If the volume of construction in 1955 conforms to the volume of these previous years as compared to people's plans, 1955 construction would be at an all-time high of over 1,500,000 dwellings.

In New York State, Commissioner McMurray reported, the rate of construction is lagging behind that of the Nation. In 1950, when there was a national construction level of almost 1,400,000, the rate of construction in New York State was 124,000 units, or 8.85 percent of the national total. The year just completed, 1954, saw a rate of 1,220,000 nationally, while there were only 94,000 starts in New York State, or 7.70 percent of the national total.

In terms of the need in New York State, housing starts certainly should be in the same proportion, or greater than that of 1950. Certainly, as a goal, we should not count on less.

Aside from the FHA insured rental and cooperative-type housing and a relatively few projects financed by some of the large financial institutions, there has been practically no other rental-type housing built in New York State in the past 20 years.

Between 1950 and 1953, in New York City, the amount of money loaned by savings banks for mortgages of \$50,000 and over (in which class new apartment house mortgages are found) declined by 29 percent on the average. By way of contrast, during the same general period, from 1949 to 1954, the mortgage portfolio of New York City savings banks increased by 87.5 percent from \$4 billion to \$7.6 billion.

The fact that New York City has so many urban renewal problems offers even greater opportunities for sound investment, he indicated to the savings bank women.

Commissioner McMurray described his philosophy of Government action to improve the welfare of the people as based on a reliance upon reason, knowledge, and truth. He indicated the many approaches he is making toward evolving a program of cooperation and coordination with the building industry, financial institutions, Federal and municipal agencies so that the State division of housing can better meet the needs of all the people.

Much of his attention, he said, is being devoted toward helping develop measures to stimulate the production of a large supply of good housing for the average wage earner

and salaried person, the large group who are, for the most part, still in the no-man's-land of housing, ineligible for subsidized public housing because of incomes a little too high, yet earning too little to buy their own homes or rent available FHA housing at current high costs. He predicted the development of a number of such aids within a short time.

Commissioner McMurray also pointed out various ways in which deteriorating areas of the city could be redeveloped through a combined use of Federal urban renewal aids and those available under the State's slum clearance program. He indicted the role savings banks could play in this process and urged their assumption of their full share of responsibility in rebuilding the city.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the evidence which points to a growing need for home construction, we must all realize the attempt to cut back the volume of construction is obviously inspired by those who profit most on scarcity and who fear a housing program to meet the real needs of the American people.

I am sure that the members of the House Armed Services Committee will want to study carefully the long-range implications of the announced intention of the Veterans' Administration to bar GI home mortgages which require no down payment or closing fees from the veteran-purchaser. If this is done, many veterans will be denied the opportunity to buy homes which they urgently need for their growing families.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1955

Rev. Lawrence D. Folkemer, of the Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant us the knowledge of Thy holy will and then the grace and courage to accept it. Deliver us from any pious and superficial praying of the petition "Thy will be done" when we have no thought of pursuing any but our own selfish will. May Thy will be done in us first and then through us in the world.

Help us to put our trust in Thee, O God, and not in ourselves only, lest we lose the ability to trust ourselves and others. Teach us to look unto the hills, daily, from whence cometh our help.

May we never become too big or too important to pray, nor too proud to confess our sins, either as individuals or as a people. Convince us by Thy holy spirit that prayer is power and repentance is not weakness but moral strength. Whatever may be done here today that is good and true, uphold by Thy gracious power; whatever may be shortsighted and weak, bring to noneffect; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Sen-

ator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 13, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 140)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 13, 1955,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 13, 1955, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental

appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 138) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any statements made during the morning hour be limited to the usual 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN ILLEGAL PRACTICES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the over-obligation of the appropriation for operating expenses, Atomic Energy Commission, for travel to be performed by the Division of Organization and Personnel in the current fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOMINATION OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL AS CADETS TO AIR FORCE ACADEMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Force Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND (S. Doc. No. 39)

A letter from the Managing Trustee and members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 15th Annual Report on that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AUDIT REPORT ON VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, ADJACENT TO GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit on lands adjacent to Great Smoky Mountains National Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOHN L. BOYER, JR.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REIMBURSEMENT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSMISSION OF OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT-MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat.

614), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON PROGRESS AND FEASIBILITY OF TOLL ROADS AND THEIR RELATION TO FEDERAL-AID PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the progress and feasibility of toll roads, and their relation to the Federal-aid program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Resolution 25

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States Senate bill 205, which would provide funds to the several States for the development of public library services in rural areas without such services or without adequate services; and

"Whereas the passage of the library services bill would provide direct cultural and educational benefits of incalculable value to more than two-thirds of the people of this State; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Alabama is justly proud that the library services bill was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator LISTER HILL of this State, and that a companion measure was introduced in the United States House of Representatives by the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, also of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama hereby commends Senator LISTER HILL for his action in introducing said Senate bill 205, and urges the immediate passage of the bill by the Congress of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house transmit a copy of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Alabama.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives of Alabama, March 29, 1955.

"Concurred in and adopted by the senate March 29, 1955.

"Approved by the Governor April 8, 1955."

Resolutions adopted by the Gate of Heaven Council, No. 468, Knights of Columbus, Huntington, and Brooklyn Council, No. 60, Brooklyn, both of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Society of American Military Engineers, Washington, D. C., relating to the training and utilization of specialized scientific and engineering personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. Young):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture to take appropriate steps to correct unwarranted and unfair discrimination in respect to acreage allotments for hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota

"Whereas there has never been and there is not now a surplus or oversupply of hard spring wheat; and

"Whereas the allotment of hard spring wheat acreage throughout the State of North Dakota is so low in many instances that many farmers can not operate their farm successfully and produce sufficient agricultural products and livestock to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families; and

"Whereas there is unquestionably an unfair discrimination against the small hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota as compared with soft wheat farmers in other States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary and appropriate steps to provide a premium on milling grades of hard spring wheat and to allocate as a minimum to any operator who has raised 100 acres or more of hard wheat during the past 5 years, an acreage equal to the maximum acreage of such operator, but in no event should such allocation if under 100 acres ever be reduced; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States; to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives; to the Secretary of Agriculture; and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in Congress.

"C. P. DAHL,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD LENO,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"K. A. FITCH,

"Speaker of the House.

"KENNETH L. MORGAN,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans, the same as death pensions granted to surviving World War I widows and orphans

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased veterans of World War I who had 90 days or more of active military service in the Armed Forces of the United States or who were discharged for disability incurred in active military service in less than 90 days, we believe the same legislation should be passed giving the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to surviving widows and orphans of World War I due to the fact that the surviving widows of World War II and the Korean conflict deceased veterans have young children and are very much in need of assistance in caring for their families: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact necessary legislation granting to the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to the surviving widows and orphans of World War I deceased veterans; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution properly authenticated to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress of the United States, and

to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Concurrent Resolution Z-1

"Concurrent resolution urging that import restrictions upon Selkirk wheat be eased

"Whereas the farmers of the State of North Dakota suffered heavy damage during the 1954 crop season resulting from a heavy infestation of 15B rust upon hard spring wheat; and

"Whereas a hard spring wheat named Selkirk has been developed in Canada which is highly rust-resistant; and

"Whereas such Selkirk wheat is available for sale in Canada but cannot be exported to the United States because of an embargo by the Canadian Government; and

"Whereas if a sufficient supply of rust-resistant varieties of hard spring wheat is not obtained by the farmers of the State of North Dakota, extreme hardship may result during the 1955 crop season: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That this legislative assembly hereby urges and requests that all responsible officials of the United States Government take all possible action to obtain the termination of the embargo imposed by the Canadian Government on the export of Selkirk wheat, so that a reasonable amount of Selkirk wheat, of a purity test not less than 95 percent, can be made available to the farmers of the State of North Dakota for planting in the spring of 1955; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States; the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; and to all Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation; Be it further

"Resolved, That the control and purchase of such Selkirk wheat as may be obtained be handled by the North Dakota Experiment Station at the Agricultural College at Fargo, and distributed throughout the State by the county extension agents on a fair and equitable basis.

"F. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

"House Concurrent Resolution J-1

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to authorize North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming to enter into a compact for an equitable division among the States of the water supply of the Little Missouri River

"Whereas there is an urgent need for a compact among North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming for equitable apportionment of the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries among those States to assure owners of lands lying near or adjacent to this river or its tributaries their equitable share of the waters thereof for stock watering, irrigation, and domestic use: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate

concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming to negotiate a compact or agreement, upon such terms and conditions as Congress may deem fit, and require, not later than January 1, 1959, for a division and equitable apportionment among the States for the water supply of the Little Missouri River and streams tributary thereto; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be, and is hereby, directed to mail copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota in Congress, and to the Governors of the States of South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"House Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing a study and investigation into the feasibility of establishing additional manufacturing enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations in this State

"Whereas the establishment of a jewel-bearing plant adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation has provided much-needed job opportunities for Indians residing in the area and has brought into productivity a formerly unutilized labor force and has thereby been an aid to the general economy of the area and to the wealth of the Nation; and

"Whereas the employment records of the jewel-bearing plant located adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation show that absenteeism and turnover among Indian employees are lower than the national average for similar industries; and

"Whereas the locating of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations is a positive act of providing social and economic opportunities for rehabilitation of and self-help for Indians; and

"Whereas the establishment of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations has proved to be beneficial to the Indians residing on and near such reservations, to the State of North Dakota, and to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully petitioned to enact proper legislation to provide for a thorough investigation and affirmative encouragement for such self-rehabilitating projects which will result in the elimination of dependency and the establishment of a substantial self-supporting status for Indian people; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Director of Defense Mobilization, and to each of the Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution X

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would create an agricultural rating for pilots engaged in the aerial application of agricultural chemicals

"Whereas the need for pilots and airplanes for aerial application of agricultural chemicals in the State of North Dakota and many other Midwest farm States is increasing more rapidly than the available commercially licensed pilots; and

"Whereas in North Dakota during the year of 1954 over 200 airplanes and pilots were licensed by the State aeronautics commission to engage in aerial crop spraying and dusting, and as newer chemicals are developed for the control of insects and plant diseases, the needs of the farmers of this State may require as many as three or four hundred agricultural planes and pilots; and

"Whereas in the State of North Dakota and other agricultural States there is a large reserve of privately licensed pilots and flying farmers, some of whom could qualify for a Federal agricultural rating, if the rating were based on flying ability, flight hours, and knowledge of agricultural chemicals, which would greatly relieve the present and future shortage of pilots qualified to engage in agricultural flying: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully petitioned to enact such legislation as may be necessary to create an agricultural pilot rating for aerial crop spraying and dusting activities in the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Washington, D. C.; to the chairmen of the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the Congress of the United States; and to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution opposing repeal of long and short haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act

"Whereas there will be proposed and introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation providing for repeal of the long and short haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

"Whereas the repeal of the long and short haul clause would permit railroad companies to assess lower rates and charges for long hauls than for shorter hauls over the same route in the same direction; and

"Whereas the charging of a higher rate for a short haul than for a longer haul, the shorter being included within the longer, is now forbidden on North Dakota intrastate traffic in section 49-0409 of the North Dakota Revised Code of 1943; and

"Whereas the passage of such legislation will result in increased freight rates and charges on articles moving in interstate commerce to and from North Dakota, particularly on grain, lignite, and other commodities, to the detriment of producers, shippers, and consumers of the State of North Dakota; that it would encourage discriminations in

rates against small shippers in favor of large shippers that would be against the public interest; and would, we believe, be in the end detrimental to the best interests of the railroads themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to deny the passage of any legislation providing for the repeal or amendment of the long and short haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, when, as, and if presented for its consideration; be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to defeat the aforesaid type of legislation upon presentation to the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota.

"K. A. FITCH,

"Speaker of the House.

"KENNETH L. MORGAN,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"C. P. DAHL,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD LENO,

"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. LEHMAN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution 45

"Whereas some large industrial areas in this State are presently suffering from excessive unemployment because of curtailed production; and

"Whereas many large contracts for defense materials, such as M-48 tanks, which could have been manufactured with existing facilities in such areas of surplus labor in this State, have been awarded to large companies in other States; and

"Whereas it is the declared policy of the Office of Defense Mobilization to encourage full utilization of existing production facilities and workers in preference to creating new plants or moving workers and also to award negotiated procurement contracts to industries in labor surplus areas provided no price differential is paid therefor; and

"Whereas the requirement that no price differential be paid in order to award such contracts to firms in labor surplus areas has, to a great extent, defeated the purposes of the before-mentioned policy which was designed to relieve unemployment in distressed areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature hereby urgently requests the Federal Government to bring about an immediate amendment to Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 so that labor surplus areas may be given consideration for Government contracts, even where some price differential is involved, provided that in the opinion of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization the requirements of the distressed area justify the additional cost involved; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature also requests the Federal Government to revise its present policy of concentrating the production of certain defense items, such as tanks, in the hands of a single large producer and provide instead that such items shall be manufactured at a number of different facilities throughout the country with special consideration being given to facilities located in areas suffering from critical unemployment; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to take all necessary steps to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

"By order of the senate,

"WILLIAM S. KING,

"Secretary.

"In assembly April 2, 1955; concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk."

DESIGNATION OF LAKE BEHIND McNARY DAM AS ALDRICH LAKE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Oregon State Legislature asking that the lake behind McNary Dam on the Columbia River be named Aldrich Lake, in tribute to the late E. B. Aldrich, publisher of the Pendleton East Oregonian, and a pioneer in the crusade to develop waterpower and navigation on this great waterway of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Aldrich is remembered throughout Oregon as a man of integrity and vision, who defied carping critics in his persistent advocacy of multipurpose development of the Columbia River. Some of these critics predicted that Columbia River projects never would fulfill their purpose. The success of these projects is the most enduring monument which Mr. Aldrich could have erected to his memory.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, under the rule, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 12

To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States; to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior; to the Honorable Senators and Representatives from Oregon in Congress of the United States of America, and to the Board on Geographic Names:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas in 1954 the President of the United States of America threw the governing switch which sent thousands of kilowatts of electrical energy, from a mighty dam that had just been constructed spanning the Columbia River, an historical day for the Nation marking another milestone in the progress of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas it was proper and fitting that the dam should be named McNary in order to perpetuate the name of this illustrious pioneer statesman, Charles Linza McNary, who, cooperating with his friends and neighbors, had within the span of one lifetime built from an unexplored wilderness and sagebrush country a progressive and stable part of our United States, homes and industries of the Northwest consuming hundreds of thousands of kilowatts provided by McNary Dam and other dams promoted by Senator McNary and his neighbors; and

Whereas Oregon and Washington owe so much to pioneer citizens whose hard work and fortitude made the Northwest great; and

Whereas the dam being named McNary after a pioneer statesman, it would be proper and fitting that the waters creating a lake back of McNary Dam be named Aldrich Lake as a memento to that tireless newspaper editor, Edwin Burton Aldrich, who spent his entire life using his pen to achieve greater things for the Pacific Northwest through the development of its water resources; and

Whereas E. B. Aldrich, editor of the East Oregonian in Pendleton, Ore., was the leader at the first meeting ever called for the development of the resources of the Columbia River; and

Whereas E. B. Aldrich was one of the Northwest's representatives sent to alert the Congress of our Nation and Corps of Engineers of the power potentialities of the Columbia River; and

Whereas it was E. B. Aldrich and his associates who secured the first money ever appropriated for the study of the Columbia River; and from that meager appropriation of \$50,000 from the Congress of the United States and \$10,000 from the State of Oregon an embryo was created from which has emerged multipurpose dams on the Columbia River; and

Whereas although E. B. Aldrich's pen was forever stilled by his death in 1950, a record of his achievements should be marked for all time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to name this lake Aldrich Lake; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Wayne Morse, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Richard Neuberger, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Walter Norblad, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Sam Coon, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Edith Green, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Harris Ellsworth, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; and the Board of Geographic Names.

Adopted by house March 23, 1955.

EDITH BYRON LOW,
Chief Clerk.

E. B. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 30, 1955.

ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.

REMOVAL OF BULK COMMODITY EXEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO INLAND WATER CARRIERS—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a very important letter from John P. Madgett, general manager of the Dairyland Power Cooperative, which serves 87,000 farmers and rural businesses in the 4-State area of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois. Mr. Madgett writes concerning the adverse effect of legislation to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to inland water carriers by amending part 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE,
La Crosse, Wis., March 25, 1955.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On February 4, 1955, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce introduced by request Senate bill 951. The purpose of the bill is to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to inland water carriers by amending part III of the Interstate Commerce Act. Passage of the bill would have the effect of extending the regulatory powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to inland water transportation of dry bulk commodities.

A close perusal of this bill leads us to the conclusion that we oppose passage of the legislation for the following reasons:

1. The time schedule, geographic rights, and commodity rights provisions of the bill are needlessly restrictive. They are unrealistic, unfair, and in our opinion totally unconscionable.

2. It will discriminate against the Mississippi waterway while still exempting traffic in the Great Lakes and in the off-shore trades.

3. We believe it is a needless extension of Federal authority.

4. It will throttle and kill present healthy competition.

5. It will promote monopoly and a cartel type of economy.

6. It will unduly benefit few carriers to the detriment of the many.

7. Because of the operation of the price structure for water transportation when under Interstate Commerce Commission regulation as exemplified by 15 years past experience, we are convinced that the enactment of S. 951 will have the effect of substantially increasing the rates for shipment of bulk commodities and will signal the end of low-cost inland water transportation.

8. Dairyland Power Cooperative and the 87,000 farmers and rural businesses which it serves will be adversely affected for various reasons. The price of coal will rise and, hence, the cost of electrical energy will go up. Farmers will be paying more for fertilizer, and profits on grain sales when shipped by barge will go down. A wide variety of prices to consumers will increase.

In contrast we believe that under existing law:

1. We have open, free and fair competition among all carriers. Even certificated common carriers are free to and do compete with the unregulated carriers for liquid and dry bulk cargoes.

2. There has been a healthy and continuing expansion of the transportation industry without regulation. The bulk commodity field is one in which "small business" has had a chance and where there is presently a minimum of monopoly.

3. Competition has held the price structure in line to the mutual benefit of shipper, carrier, consumer, and the general public. None has been hurt, everyone has benefited.

4. Long-term "tailor-made" service contracts between carrier and shipper or buyer characterizes much of the current contract carrier business. Dairyland Power Cooperative, one of the many large buyers of coal, sees no valid reason why this system should not continue.

As you know, Dairyland is now supplying electrical energy to 87,000 farmers and rural businesses in the 4-State area of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois, of which 60,000 are located in the State of Wisconsin. Of Dairyland's 9 generating stations, with a total

capacity of 165,000 kilowatts, the 3 largest are steam power stations located on the Mississippi River at Alma, Genoa and Cassville. An additional 50,000-kilowatt unit is now being installed at Alma and will be on the line in late 1956. Coal represents the largest single item in the cost of production of electrical energy in steam stations, representing approximately 50 to 55 percent of the total final cost. These 3 plants annually consume 300,000 tons of coal which is brought by barge up the Mississippi River during the navigation season. Years of competition have established a differential between rail and water transportation in this region so that at the present time Dairyland can get coal by barge at an average of \$1.75 per ton cheaper than by rail. Should the price of coal substantially increase for any reason you can well appreciate the increased costs involved inasmuch as we anticipate that increased demands for electricity will require us to use a minimum of 500,000 tons of coal annually by 1960.

We appreciate the heavy duties which you are carrying and that this is just one of many bills which you must consider. However, we, the directors, management, and farmer members of the Dairyland Power Cooperative, would sincerely appreciate any effort that you can make before either the Senate or House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in order to get the foregoing viewpoints before the committee. Should you desire further information from us as to our operations and as to our opposition to this bill, kindly feel free to write.

Yours very truly,

JOHN P. MADGETT,
General Manager.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Richard Jack Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1678. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration; and

S. 1679. A bill to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary. (See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1680. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Port Washington Harbor, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1681. A bill for the relief of Cecile Doriac and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1682. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Intrilago Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1683. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1684. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Luxembourg, also known as Henry Luxembourg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1685. A bill for the relief of Christa Linek Toth; and

S. 1686. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Akbar Ashraf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1687. A bill for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1688. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1689. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1690. A bill for the relief of Julia van Reigersberg Versluys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1691. A bill to insure the most effective and equitable distribution of infantile paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt transportation by air taxi from the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1694. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to strengthen national defense and to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 1695. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special 10-cent piece in recognition of the recent discovery of a vaccine by Dr. Jonas E. Salk for the prevention of poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1696. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of the following officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration: Ivan N. Burlingame, John Marlin, Thomas C. McDougald, and Irene K. Shinn, which has been submitted by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany this bill the letter forwarded with this proposal by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1678) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1955.
Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NIXON: Enclosed is a bill for the relief of the following officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration: Ivan N. Burlingame, John Marlin, Thomas C. McDougald, and Irene K. Shinn.

The purpose of the bill is to reimburse the employees in amounts totaling \$84.84, representing payments made from their personal funds to cover deficiencies incurred in their accounts without any fault or negligence on their part. The accounts were the accounts maintained in connection with ownership and operation of a war-housing project. The Public Housing Administration operated these projects and the employees involved were accountable for the funds. The relevant facts in each case are set out below:

Ivan N. Burlingame was general housing manager of the war-housing projects in Badger, Wis. He paid \$10 from his personal funds to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago to cover the deposit of a counterfeit Federal Reserve note. The counterfeit currency was included in a deposit made by the project office and received in the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago on July 6, 1954. The bank notified Mr. Burlingame on July 7 that in verifying the currency and coin included in the deposit it found a \$10 counterfeit note, which it turned over to the United States Secret Service on that date, at its request. The bank transmitted the joint counterfeit receipt to Mr. Burlingame and asked him to remit \$10 to the bank to cover the counterfeit note. Thereafter, on July 14, 1954, Mr. Burlingame sent his personal check in the amount of \$10, payable to the Treasurer of the United States, to the bank. Mr. Burlingame stated that the counterfeit note was accepted by one of two project employees from a project tenant in payment of rent due and that it is quite impossible to determine who accepted the note or from what tenant it might have been received. He is of the opinion that in all probability the tenant who had the note in his possession and used it for paying his rent was unaware of the fact that it was counterfeit. Mr. Burlingame asked the Secret Service to return the counterfeit note to his office so that it could be studied by the employees who accept rent. The employees, as well as Mr. Burlingame, experienced extreme difficulty in detecting any difference between it and a valid note. The Federal Reserve bank advised Mr. Burlingame that the note would not be classified as particularly difficult for its trained sorters to detect, but that to a nontrained person it would be most difficult to detect.

John Marlin was general housing manager of the war housing projects in Tullahoma, Tenn. He paid \$29.84 from his personal funds to replace stolen project funds. On July 26, 1948, in checking up cash at the close of the day, a shortage of \$160 was discovered. The local police and FBI were called in to investigate the matter. A meeting of maintenance and office employees developed the fact that three individuals had been in the office while the clerk-stenographer was momentarily absent getting tools from the shop and one of them could have robbed the cash drawer of the missing amount during her absence. The local police and the FBI investigated 2 of 3 suspects in the case, found 1 of them guilty of the theft,

and obtained a confession from him. Mr. Marlin had in the meantime replaced the amount of the loss from his personal funds. The total amount of recovery from the thief was \$130.16, leaving unrecovered personal funds advanced by Mr. Marlin in the amount of \$29.84.

Thomas C. McDougald was the management aide of the Carver Court housing project in Coatesville, Pa. He paid \$25 from his personal funds to replace change funds stolen from the Carver Court housing project office. The agent cashier serving at the time in Coatesville, Pa., had been advanced a fund of \$100. A portion of this fund was used for making change at the Carver Court Housing Project, as well as at another project in the locality. The sum of \$25 had been advanced from the fund to Mr. McDougald for the purpose of making change and was kept in a safe at the project. During the weekend of January 14, 1951, the project safe was broken open and robbed of the \$25 change fund together with \$45.50 in rent payments taken after banking hours. The \$25 change fund was replaced by Mr. McDougald and was included in the final accounting to the Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, by the agent cashier. The \$45.50 in stolen rent money was charged against August J. Fink, general housing manager, who has been granted relief in this amount by the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the act of August 1, 1947, 67 Stat. 720.

Irene K. Shinn was accounting clerk in the project office at San Diego, Calif. She voluntarily paid \$20 from her personal funds to cover a counterfeit Federal Reserve Bank note. On January 9, 1950, she unknowingly accepted the note during the course of collecting \$5,937.10 in receipts for the day. The counterfeit note was included in a shipment of funds to the depository, the United States National Bank of San Diego, on January 9, but was not detected until after the depository had forwarded the same wrapper of "twenties" on January 12 to the Federal Reserve Bank of Los Angeles. The Federal Reserve Bank impounded the note and turned it over to the United States Secret Service. The note was made available to the depository and representatives of the project office for scrutiny. The depository and project representatives stated that the counterfeit was very difficult to detect. The depository requested replacement of the counterfeit note and the project office had no alternative but to recover from the employee, Mrs. Shinn, who had accepted the note.

The act of August 1, 1947, 61 Stat. 720, authorizes the General Accounting Office to relieve, in proper cases, accountable officers of responsibility on account of deficiencies of Government funds, vouchers, et cetera, if, while the officer or agent was acting in the discharge of his official duties, the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on his part. The Comptroller General has held, however, 27 Comp. Gen. 404, and in several subsequent decisions involving the application of this act, that its provisions have no application where restitution has been made by the employee involved, since in such a case there is no deficiency in his accounts for the relief of which consideration might be given under that act. In each of the four cases outlined above, the persons were advised that under this interpretation by the Comptroller General it would not be possible to obtain reimbursement.

In the case of Ivan N. Burlingame we sent a letter to the General Accounting Office on September 22, 1954, requesting reconsideration of the ruling in 27 Comp. Gen. 404. In this request it was pointed out that an interpretation of the relief statute which renders it inapplicable solely because the accountable officer has made payment seems to defeat the purpose of the act and tends to penalize accountable officers who manifest

good faith by putting their accounts in balance pending determination of the question of relief. In decision B-121557, dated November 5, 1954, in response to the letter of September 22, 1954, the General Accounting Office reaffirmed its earlier decision to the effect that the act of August 1, 1947, does not apply in such cases. Concerning the effect of this interpretation on accountable officers who acted in good faith, the General Accounting Office stated:

"This Office has recognized that inequities would arise as a result of such interpretation of the relief act involved and the matter has been thoroughly considered, not only at the time the decision referred to above was rendered but also in a number of subsequent decisions involving the application of that act. See particularly, B-101301, July 19, 1951 (copy enclosed), wherein the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was advised that relief could not be granted under the act to an accountable officer who had covered with personal funds a deficiency in her account resulting from her acceptance of a counterfeit \$50 bill. For the reasons therein stated, it is the view of this Office that the act is open to no other construction and that any inequities which arise from such construction are for the consideration of the Congress. Consequently, this office has, in proper cases, favorably reported on several private relief measures and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was advised that this office would not object to his sponsorship of a relief bill on behalf of the employee involved in that decision and on behalf of other employees of his administration similarly situated."

In view of the denial of relief in such cases by the General Accounting Office and the fact that the officers and employees acted in good faith to enable the accounts to be placed in a state of balance, congressional relief in the form of the bill herewith enclosed appears to be the only solution to an otherwise inequitable result, and I therefore respectfully recommend favorable action on this bill by the Congress.

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT OF JULY 1, 1898

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto. The proposed legislation was forwarded from the National Bankruptcy Conference, and was submitted by Mr. Horsky, a member of a prominent law firm.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1679) to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SEED ACT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUM-

PHREY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend one of the penalty provisions of the Federal Seed Act. The purpose of the bill is to remove the stigma of having petty and unknowing violations of the Federal Seed Act by reputable businessmen in the seed industry being classified as criminal violations.

This amendment will enable the Government to hereafter have the option to bring civil proceedings for violations of the Federal Seed Act in addition to criminal actions. In civil proceedings the Government will not have to prove intent, but in criminal actions to "knowingly" violate the provisions of the act will be a factor in determining the violator's guilt.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1638) to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISTRIBUTION OF POLIO VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to introduce a bill and briefly discuss this thrilling subject. The world is so beset with problems and dilemmas that some of us occasionally feel downcast.

In recent days we have witnessed a triumph of the human spirit. The development by Dr. Jonas E. Salk of a successful vaccine to prevent infantile paralysis is an historic occasion that equals the invention of pasteurization, the defeat of yellow fever, and the stamping out of smallpox.

We have our troubles, and they are solved only to have new ones replace them. The perfection of the polio vaccine must make us all feel that human ingenuity and dedication can make a better world. It is thrilling to witness this landmark in the battle against a crippling disease.

Every parent must have felt a surge of relief when the official announcement came that the Salk vaccine has proven to be 60 percent to 80 percent effective as a preventative of infantile paralysis. That was the verdict on the mass inoculation experiment of last year.

Since that time the vaccine has been improved so that it is even more effective.

Millions of Americans have contributed their dimes and dollars for some 20 years to the March of Dimes, and this victory belongs in large measure to all of the people in the United States.

It belongs also to those dedicated men and women of science who have worked around the clock in laboratories to test and test. Even the experiments that

failed contributed to the final success—as one alternative after another eliminated false starts and narrowed down the path.

And the final victory belongs to a brilliant young doctor, Jonas Salk, and his associates, who had the imagination and industry and faith to bring forth this new blessing to mankind.

He was asked who owns the patent on the vaccine, and replied that no one does. "Can you patent the sun?" he inquired. He said that it belongs to the American people, who contributed to the March of Dimes.

Here indeed is a dedicated and unselfish man, whose greatest compensation is contributing to the welfare of mankind.

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY TO BE CONGRATULATED

The private pharmaceutical industry of the country is deserving of our thanks and praise. It has invested millions of dollars in manufacturing vast quantities of the vaccine before it was known definitely that it was a success. The industry has performed a great public service.

PROBLEMS OF SHORTAGE

However, there has not been time to manufacture sufficient quantities of the vaccine to meet the total needs of our whole population before the polio season this summer.

Great stress has been placed upon this fact in the press and radio. However, there is no great cause for alarm—if we act wisely and unselfishly.

There is sufficient vaccine for some 39 million children. Dr. Salk has said that he believes the vaccine may be more effective and more widely available if only 2 inoculations are given instead of the 3 inoculations used in last year's test. By this method at least 50 million sets of vaccinations can be given this year.

WHO SHALL DECIDE PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

It is necessary that the available vaccine be used sensibly and most effectively. If the proper methods of distribution are used, even those who are not vaccinated will be protected, Dr. Salk has explained. If those most susceptible to infection are inoculated, the sources of infection to those who are not vaccinated are reduced.

Dr. Salk has explained that children in certain age groups are most susceptible to infantile paralysis. The very young and older children are less likely to get the disease than children of 5 to 12 years old. That is the most dangerous age bracket, as far as susceptibility to polio is concerned, so medical science tells us.

A system must be devised to make sure that the youngsters who are in the greatest danger get treatment first. Then the younger and older children should be inoculated, and finally adults.

By next year there is expected to be enough vaccine to go around.

The problem is immediate and short run.

Dr. Salk suggests that a Government agency should arrange distribution and allocation of the vaccine. He said:

I think it is unfair, really, to let everyone decide for himself who gets what * * * It seems to me there ought to be some central

intelligence that could indicate or at least suggest what should be done, if not to specify the way in which one would approach this problem.

A COMMITTEE TO COMBAT INFANTILE PARALYSIS

I am introducing a bill which I believe will accomplish what the inventor of the vaccine suggests.

My bill provides that a commission of five, headed by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, decide priorities of distribution and vaccination. The commission would consist of the Surgeon General, Dr. Salk, if he would be willing to serve, a representative of State public health officials, a representative of vaccine manufacturers, and a representative of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

Mr. President, it can be seen that the personnel of such a commission would represent very well the American medical profession. We are greatly indebted to the medical profession for the years of researching it has been doing in connection with this dread disease.

This Commission would be representative of those who know most about polio and the vaccine and who could provide impartial judgment as to its best use.

VACCINE SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO NEED

It is to be expected that they would establish priorities by age group and physical condition such as pregnancy, according to the degree of susceptibility to infection. They also could meet local emergencies if any should develop.

I believe the American people want to act wisely and unselfishly in this matter. We can avert difficulties if there is an official umpire to insure absolute fairness. Under those circumstances everyone will abide by rules of uniform application and no one will seek preferential treatment.

What I propose is a group of scientific traffic policemen who will set up traffic lights to avoid speeding and collisions.

My bill provides for fines—substantial fines—for knowing violation of the rules laid down by the Commission to Control Infantile Paralysis.

The Commission would go out of existence when it determines that there is sufficient vaccine and knowledge about its proper use. That should be in about a year.

I want to make it crystal clear, Mr. President, that I am not proposing a commission that is to be set up and to continue in perpetuity. I am proposing an emergency commission, to meet an emergency need, namely, to see to it that the control of the vaccine which is going to be available next year is used to the best effect in protecting the people against susceptibility to polio paralysis infection during the coming year, until a quantity of vaccine can be manufactured so that it can be dispensed in the ordinary commercial way, through the offices of our doctors, to all patients as they come.

We now have a vaccine that can reduce and almost eliminate the child killer and crippler, infantile paralysis. We must use it wisely. We can avert unfairness and misuse of this new blessing.

I have faith that we shall do it.

Mr. President, I am not wedded to the particular procedure I am proposing. I introduce this bill only in order to focus attention upon the need of the Federal Government's proceeding to do what it can, within its legislative powers, to protect the health of all the people of this country, and to make the most effective use of this short supply of vaccine until an adequate supply can be manufactured for all.

I am sure that today all Americans join in prayers of thanksgiving and also pray that we shall conduct ourselves in such a way that we shall be deserving of this great discovery, the Salk vaccine.

In closing, and prior to introducing the bill, Mr. President, I desire to pay a very sincere tribute to Dr. Salk and his associates for what will be recognized in medical history, I believe, as one of the great monuments in medical progress.

I now introduce the bill, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1691) to insure the most effective and equitable distribution of infantile paralysis vaccine, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the American people are profoundly grateful that a vaccine has been developed which is an effective preventive of infantile paralysis. That development was financed by the voluntary contributions of the people of the United States and prosecuted by devoted scientists who seek no profit.

It is the policy of the Congress to insure the most effective and equitable distribution of the Salk vaccine while supplies remain too limited to meet the total needs of the whole population.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in the first section of this act, there is established a Commission to be known as the Commission To Control Infantile Paralysis (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and four additional members to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. One such member shall be a State health official: 1 shall be a representative of the manufacturers of the Salk vaccine; and 1 shall be a representative of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall invite Doctor Jonas Salk to serve as the fifth member of the Commission. In the event that Doctor Salk is unable to serve, the Secretary shall appoint as a member in his stead a scientist who has specialized in the study and treatment of poliomyelitis.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially recognized.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed (1) to issue mandatory rules and regulations regulating the distribution and use of all Salk vaccine manufactured in, imported into, and exported from the United States (including but not limited to the

establishment of priorities by age group, physical condition, and geographical location) with a view to insuring the most effective and equitable use of Salk vaccine, and (2) to make such reports to the Congress as it may deem necessary, including recommendations for further legislation deemed by it to be desirable to implement the policies of this act. Any such report may recommend the enactment of legislation by the Congress to maintain reasonable prices of Salk vaccine whenever it shall determine that the price of such vaccine or substantial amounts thereof has become unreasonably high.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia, but it may hold meetings at such other places in the United States as it may deem necessary.

(b) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall serve on the Commission without compensation in addition to that received for his service as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 5. The functions exercised under this act by the Commission shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act, but the Commission shall provide for the greatest practicable distribution and publication of its rules and regulations.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to limit or supersede the applicability of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by any rule or regulation promulgated under the authority of this act shall, upon conviction, be fined \$5,000.

SEC. 9. The Commission, and all authority conferred under this act, shall terminate at such time as the Commission shall report to the President and the Congress that there is sufficient Salk vaccine to make unnecessary further controls under this act.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to direct attention at this time to National Hospital Week, sponsored by American Hospital Association, which will be observed this year from May 8 through May 14.

It is particularly fitting that the Nation should set aside these 7 days to mark the importance to our people of the American hospital of today.

It is almost 300 years since the first hospital was established here in this land that was to become the United States. During those 300 years the change in the concept of the word "hospital" and its meaning to our people has indeed been remarkable.

First regarded as places to which one went only to die, 300 years of progress has made the hospital today a place where the sick and the suffering, the broken in body and in health, go to be comforted and restored to health and strength.

The hospital of today combines the skill of the physician, the tender care of the nurse, and the devotion, training, and experience of pathologists, radiologists, and other medical specialists, and laboratory technicians, therapists, and all those others who devote themselves to the service of saving the lives of their fellow men, and whose efforts are so skillfully coordinated by the modern hospital administrator.

Our hospitals have grown in number since 1658 from one to over seven thousand. This in itself is remarkable. Yet we do not overlook the fact that 1 modern hospital of today is, to the people it serves, worth 7,000 of the hospitals which might have existed 300 years ago.

Too few realize that these complex centers, dedicated to fighting disease, to relieving human suffering and to preventing needless death, symbolize the new role which high quality patient care plays in the life of America. As hospitals in thousands of communities across the length and breadth of this land have improved and expanded in facility and function, they have become the heart and center of health activities in those communities.

Not only has the hospital of our day earned and won our confidence; it has paved the way for voluntary prepayment health insurance systems like Blue Cross and Blue Shield to bring within the reach of more of our people the blessings and benefits of modern hospital and medical care.

It is fitting that the Nation grant recognition and express its gratitude to the institutions and to those men and women who devote themselves so faithfully and unselfishly to the health, the strength, and the happiness of the people of America. I am today submitting, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] a concurrent resolution whereby the Congress asks the people of the Nation to observe National Hospital Week by joining in proclaiming the importance of hospitals to the American community and in acclaiming their tradition of devoted service to our people.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are dedicated to the cause of protecting the lives and providing for the health needs of all our citizens; and

Whereas our National and State hospital associations have with diligence and unceasing efforts worked to provide the highest-quality care for all Americans in the Nation's hospitals; and

Whereas the American hospitals are the centers of our community's health services to its citizens; and

Whereas national recognition of the importance of hospitals in the American community has been celebrated annually since 1921 on the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 8, 1955, and ending May 14, 1955, will be observed as National Hospital Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join in proclaiming the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people, and to cooperate in a voluntary effort to observe National Hospital Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Address delivered by him before the City Club of Portland, Oreg., on April 8, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpts from statements dealing in part with proposed revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, delivered by Governor Harriman, of New York; Senator Lehman; Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; and Carmine G. De Sapio, national Democratic committeeman from New York; at a dinner meeting of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, held in New York City, on March 8, 1955.

Opinion of the General Counsel, General Services Administration, regarding rights of municipalities in disposing of buildings or projects constructed under the WPA.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago marked the sixth anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, and I had prepared a statement to have printed in the RECORD on that occasion, but since the Senate was not in session I was unable to have it placed in the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A few days ago, we marked the sixth anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty. This marked the beginning of something new and, we believe, constructive in international relations.

Twelve independent nations and later the others who signed pledged immediate continuance and collective action in the political, economic, social, and military fields. Our Government is of the opinion that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization makes for security in Western Europe against Communist expansion. The nations agreed that they would consult together whenever the security of any of them is threatened. When Premier Faure, of France, obtained the final approval of the Paris pacts concerning Germany just recently, he promised that his government would attempt to reinforce and improve NATO in political as well as military aspects. Likewise, Premier Scelba when he visited here advocated that NATO be de-

veloped not only along the lines of a military union but into one for economic, social, and political action.

With the agreement by all nations concerned of the Paris pact it will mean that eventually Germany will provide 12 divisions for the strengthening of NATO.

Since the inception of NATO, there is a Council in permanent session with effective power of decision meeting as much as three times a week at half-hour notice. It is served by an international staff and a large number of committee and working groups working day in and day out on a wide variety of NATO problems. There is a military organization established to defend all NATO territories against armed attack, including a network of commands covering the North Atlantic Ocean and the European Continent from the North Cape to north Africa and from the Channel to the Caucasus Mountains. There are impressive achievements in infrastructure. In all these activities there is a remarkable degree of unity. In the NATO Defense College there are officers from 8 or 10 different nations working in the same study groups learning to know each other, making enduring friendships. General Gruenther says of NATO Military Headquarters: "In my 35 years of service I have been in many headquarters, but I have never had a happier one than SHAPE." Men engaged in this work feel themselves members of an international team dedicated to the service of the alliance as a whole.

After the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in June 1945, after the collapse of Nazi Germany and a few weeks before Japan capitulated, we saw the United Nations Charter come into being in San Francisco. As everyone knows, the Charter was founded on two assumptions. First, that the five powers holding permanent seats in the Security Council—China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union—would be able to reach lasting agreement on major matters. Secondly, that apart from Russia's known claims on Japan, none of these powers sought any territorial aggrandizement. Both of these assumptions proved incorrect. A new peril came into being—Communist Russia.

The defeat of the two great military and industrial countries, Germany and Japan, left a vast vacuum of strength in the West and East, and the Kremlin took advantage of this vacuum to carry forward its expansionist program. The Kremlin drew down its Iron Curtain, refused to hold free elections in Poland, and besides that the West disarmed. We who had 3,100,000 men on the Continent, withdrew all but 391,000, within a year, and the British who had 1,321,000 within a like period withdrew 488,000. Canada within a year took all of its 299,000 men home. Then there followed a period where the Western powers sought to reach an accommodation with the Soviet Government. However, in the Moscow Conference in 1947 and in the conference which was held later the same year and in the Foreign Ministers' Conference which met in Paris in 1949, it became more and more evident that there was no hope of getting anywhere with the Kremlin.

In the meanwhile, the Soviet expansion had included Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and areas in Finland, Poland, Rumania, northeastern Germany and eastern Czechoslovakia—representing over 200,632 square miles and almost 25 million people. And the presence of the Red armies in the heart of Europe compelled Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Eastern Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia to fall under Soviet domination.

The situation was indeed becoming critical for the free nations of the West—those that remained. There seemed to be no possibility of reaching an agreement with the Soviets. Greece seemed to be sinking under

the heel of the Communists. Then it was that Uncle Sam reacted promptly. The Truman Doctrine came into play and we appropriated \$400 million for the aid of Greece and Turkey, and in June the Marshall program came into being. It was directed against hunger, poverty, chaos and slavery. We even offered economic assistance to countries behind the Iron Curtain, but Stalin refused America's aid and forced Czechoslovakia and Poland to refuse likewise.

This situation resulted in March 1948 in the representatives of Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom meeting in Brussels to discuss and sign the Treaty of Mutual Assistance. The ink was scarcely dry on the Brussels Treaty when the Soviets started the blockade of West Berlin, which lasted 323 days and was defeated by the prodigious feat of the air lift.

Out of all this tension and defiance the North Atlantic Treaty Organization began to take form; the idea being that the Brussels Treaty powers would be superseded by a larger group of countries.

On the 4th day of April 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was signed in Washington by representatives of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States and within 5 months was ratified by the Parliaments of the member countries and later by Greece and Turkey.

The North Atlantic Treaty speaks plainly and briefly about the resolution and idealism of the nations which signed it. It was written within the framework of the United Nations Charter and was based on article 51 of chapter VII. Article 5 is the essential clause. It provides: "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that if an armed attack occurs each of them will assist the party or parties thereof attacked by taking forthwith such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

To back up these words the parties agreed, under article 3, to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity, to resist armed attack and so it came about that by 1950 the different states entrusted their forces to international commanders, assisted by international staffs. This was an advance which was not missed by the Soviets.

We must realize, however, that the treaty is not exclusively a military alliance. It was born of collective security and its purpose is to promote conditions of stability and well-being and the cooperation by governments not only in the military field, but in the economic, social, and cultural as well. Six years ago this treaty came into being. It was a new experiment in international relations. It provides for the common defense of over 380 million people (if Western Germany were included it would be better than 430 million people). It has stopped the advance of the Kremlin in Europe, and it is hoped that it will spare the carnage and waste of another war.

FORMOSA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the noted author and columnist, Walter Lippmann, has written a very thoughtful and interesting series of articles on the highly dangerous and flammable situation with which we are now confronted in the Formosa Straits. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "The Offshore Entanglement," written by Walter Lippmann,

and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)

THE OFFSHORE ENTANGLEMENT

In the 2 months that have passed since Congress voted the Formosa Resolution, the President has been bearing an increasingly heavy burden of responsibility. It has been a strange development especially for him, so sincerely convinced a believer that personal government is undesirable and that Congress should participate with the Executive in the great decisions of war and peace.

The Formosa Resolution has left it to him to decide whether to defend the offshore islands at the risk of a general war. This is an extreme delegation of authority. For President Eisenhower must determine not only whether war is justified because a known and established vital interest of the United States has been violated—every President has that power and that responsibility—he must determine whether or not, and in what degree, there is an American interest in these offshore islands. Congress has left the decision entirely to him. There is no treaty obligation, there is no principle of law, which establishes an American interest in these islands. The President and Congress have not agreed upon any clear and definite juridical, strategic, or political standard to guide the Chief Executive in making the gravest decision that he can be called upon to make.

Ever since the vote in Congress, the President has been under pressure from all quarters to make a decision one way or the other. This he has thus far refused to do. Lacking a definite principle and a policy to guide him, it has seemed better to wait and see whether Peiping does anything which, when it is already happening the President then judges in the heat of the crisis to be vitally related to the defense of Formosa. Amidst all the uncertainties and pressures which converge upon the White House, it has seemed better not to make a decision and not to risk the displeasure of those who would not like the decision.

Yet this is an unsound position for the Chief Executive: that without public criteria known in advance, he must decide for peace or war after the confusion of war has begun. Can it truly be argued that it is good policy to make the Chinese guess how President Eisenhower will guess if they attack the islands? And in any event, the policy of not choosing a policy until the adversary has precipitated a crisis is an invitation to Peiping to proceed in such ways as will cause the most division and confusion in this country, in Formosa, among our allies, and in the uncommitted Asian countries.

It is never safe to assume that your adversary is a fool. And therefore it is not safe to assume that the Red Chinese will take such obvious military actions that it will be easy for the President to make a decision that will unite the country and rally its allies. There are, as anyone who has been reading the papers knows, ways of attacking these offshore islands which would not be recognizable, to use the words of the President's message, "as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores."

Our problem is how to extricate the President and the country from this predicament. When the President was persuaded in January, perhaps against his better judgment, to accept personal responsibility for the offshore islands, two things were hoped for. One was that an overwhelming vote by Congress would deter the Red Chinese from any serious military action in the Formosa Strait. The other hope was that a truce could be nego-

tiated in which the offshore islands would be used as an important bargaining point.

As to the first hope, experience has shown, I believe, that even if the Red Chinese are deterred from an open full-scale assault, they have been given a strong incentive to proceed by the other means—just short of open conventional war—which are available to them. But it is on the second point, on the hope of negotiating a cease-fire, that our knowledge now is most definite. We know, I believe, that a cease-fire cannot be had by the negotiation of a public agreement signed by all the interested parties.

A cease-fire by negotiation cannot be had because neither the Chinese Government in Peiping nor the Chinese Government in Formosa can sign such a document. For they would be agreeing to end the civil war by a partition of Chinese territory. Chiang would be renouncing his claim to be the head of the rightful Government of China; Mao Tse-Tung would be renouncing his claim to be the head of the legitimate Government of China. Peiping cannot be expected to sign such a renunciation. And we would have the greatest difficulty in persuading Chiang to sign it.

Since a truce in the Formosa Strait cannot be had by agreement between the two Chinese Governments, the best chance of preventing a dangerous war is to cut the Gordian Knot: to establish the ceasefire by an action of our own. We have the power to do that. It is not often that one nation has power of that kind. But in the Formosa Strait we have it. For all practical purposes, and over a considerable period of time at least, a military cease-fire would exist if the Nationalist forces were brought back to Formosa, if their naval and air raids, which are mere pinpricks, were discontinued, and our position in the Formosa area were made to conform to the law as laid down in our treaty with Nationalist China. This treaty provides for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. It was ratified with explicit assurance to our people that it calls for no American participation in the Chinese civil war.

This would be solid ground for the United States to stand upon. We would then be within our certain military capacities. Our stand would be in accord with our national interests. It would be acceptable, or better than that, to our allies. And last but by no means least, the ground on which we stood would be lawful ground.

The only known objection to such a forthright policy is that a decision to evacuate the offshore islands will shake the morale, and perhaps the allegiance, of the Chinese forces and Chinese officials in Formosa. Though there are countermeasures which can be taken to reduce this risk we must assume that it is a genuine risk.

But let us ask ourselves whether there is any other policy which will eliminate this risk—the risk of internal subversion and of defection. Our present policy of keeping everyone guessing and in suspense is hardly likely to keep morale high anywhere, and least of all in Formosa. How must the Chinese from the mainland, threatened with attack on the islands where Chiang has committed so many of his troops, feel when they are told that after they are under attack, the President will decide whether to support them or to let them be overwhelmed? It is not a pleasant fix to leave them in.

But suppose, then, that the President comes down off the fence and declares that these islands will be defended. How long would morale be kept high in Formosa? The answer, I submit, is that it will be kept high a little longer, but only as long as it looks possible that in defending these islands the United States will become involved in a general war to overthrow the Red government in Peiping.

For the only reason these islands are so important to the morale of the Nationalists

in Formosa is that they raise the hope that the United States will become involved in a general war—in a general war which will restore Chiang and his followers to power on the mainland. The islands are of no strategic importance to the defense of Formosa or to the personal security of the Chinese in Formosa. It is not their defense which makes these islands so important. It is that they are the last best chance of entangling the United States in the unfinished civil war. That is the bitter truth about what is called, quite unequivocally, the defense of the offshore islands.

It is the paramount interest of the United States that whenever we must fight a war we shall fight it for the legitimate and clearly defined interests of the United States, and not because we have become entangled and cannot muster the moral courage to disentangle ourselves.

CONDITIONS IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald carries a column written by Walter Lippmann under its usual title "Today and Tomorrow," and with the subheading "Unquiet Spirit." I commend the article to the careful reading of every Member of the Senate.

I suppose no one would claim that the situation in the Far East, in Southeast Asia, in Asia generally, or, in fact, in all that part of the world, is not one of great danger. It is not merely a political issue. The conditions are not merely something with which to play politics. The situation is fraught with danger, and is most difficult to handle and to work out. It requires most careful thinking on the part of our people. I must say that I have not read a more thoughtful article than has been written on the subject than the one written by Walter Lippmann and published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am certain the distinguished Senator from Alabama is aware of the fact that this very interesting and thoughtful article by Walter Lippmann is only one of a series of articles which he has written with regard to the terribly dangerous and flammable situation with which we are confronted in the Far East, and notably in the Strait of Formosa.

I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Alabama in appealing to Members of Congress and to the public generally to study these articles very carefully and to ponder them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from New York. I know that he has, at times, placed some of Mr. Lippmann's long series of articles in the RECORD.

The article published today, however, deals with the subject a little more comprehensively than any of the preceding articles, because it deals with a part of the program which we may be neglecting.

We talk of strength and military power, and all those things which are absolutely essential—and Mr. Lippmann recognizes their essentiality—but sometimes I think we may talk and think of those factors to the exclusion of the other side

of the picture, in trying to do something for those people, who are not primarily interested in military matters, and who do not have inherent within their nations and nationalities strength from a military standpoint.

Walter Lippmann points this out very clearly in his article, and brings out the weaknesses in many of the areas upon which we may be leaning for support in the great trouble which faces us.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by Mr. Lippmann, entitled "Unquiet Spirit," may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today AND Tomorrow

(By Walter Lippmann)

UNQUIET SPIRIT

Since his return from East Asia Mr. Dulles has been talking much and in ominous language. His theme has been that we must be determined and decisive in refusing to retreat any further in Asia. But he has not said this with the cool precision of a statesman whose task it is to define and to declare policy; he has been exhorting the country with the heady generalities which—before and during wars—are employed to heat up the popular emotion.

The tone of his utterances has created an impression at home and abroad that he is converted to the view of those who regard a war with China as inevitable and that, therefore, it had better be fought now when we can destroy Red China's war potential rather than postponed to a time when Red China is much stronger. I do not share this opinion that Mr. Dulles has come to believe in a preventive war, though no one should be surprised that what he has been saying has given rise to that opinion. I do not now believe that, on the ultimate issue of preventive war versus preventing war, Mr. Dulles differs as much from the President as the tone of his speeches would suggest.

To my ear, at least, Mr. Dulles has not sounded like a man who has taken a great decision and is then resolute and confident. He has sounded anxious and filled with foreboding, as if he had had a nasty shock when he was in southeast Asia and in Formosa. He has not been talking like the leader of a people in a dangerous time who, out of the clarity of his own conviction, gives courage to his people. He has been talking like a man who is troubled because he is unsure in his own mind, like a man who is not remembering how infectious is fear in high places.

As reflected in his speeches, the emotional impact of his trip was big: Was this due to evidence which he found of an increasing danger of war in the Formosa Strait? That might, of course, be an explanation. There is ground for worrying that the President has been gotten into a horrid position where he is supposed to decide after an attack begins whether to abandon to captivity and perhaps to execution, or to try to save, an important part of the National Chinese army. But I do not think this worry explains the mood of foreboding in Mr. Dulles's utterances since he came back. Nobody needs to go to southeast Asia to learn about the predicament in the Formosa Strait. It is evident enough in Washington.

My guess is that his foreboding and his despondency, approaching at moments a sense of doom, spring from his having realized by seeing at firsthand what it is not so easy to appreciate at a distance. This is how frail are the Asian reeds upon which we are leaning.

In Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and Formosa Mr. Dulles conferred with potentates, officials, officers, and politicians on whom depends our policy in that part of the world. It can have been only too painfully obvious how much is at stake on how weak a foundation. The authority of these governments is frail. The allegiance of factions, sects and clandestine groups among them is uncertain. For the containment of Communist expansion, we are relying primarily not on strong allies but on a rampart of client states, extending from Japan through Formosa to southeast Asia. Several of the vital sectors of the rampart are vulnerable to subversion, to conspiracy, to corruption and to seduction.

What makes our situation so baffling is that this outer rampart of ours is threatened even if the Communists make no attempt to conquer it by military assault. Against military conquest, we have the military means to give a good account of ourselves. The insidious threat, however, is that the rampart will crumble, and against that the Seventh Fleet and our nuclear weapons provide no relevant and effective remedy. Nor do exhortations to the Americans not to retreat. Our real problem is how to keep this outer rampart from falling apart.

The question which I venture to raise is whether the campaign which Mr. Dulles has been conducting is strengthening or is weakening our position in the rampart of client states from Japan through Formosa to Thailand. Apparently he believes that he is rallying the waverers in Asia who wish to be on the side of the winner. Is he sure that this is a sufficient view, that it is not an example of what in his address Monday evening at Georgetown University he described as "a habit of mind which is sometimes called 'localitis' " when "those who only see part of a problem quickly find a solution which seems obvious" * * * though "the obvious solution is no solution at all"?

Is it really true that warlike speeches about the conflict in the Formosa Strait, accented with the threat of atomic bombs, is now rallying or is likely to rally to our side the other weak and threatened states in the East Asian rampart? I do not see how it can be true. It seems much more likely that the nearer we seem to be coming to atomic war in the Formosa Strait, the more urgent and imperative will be the will of the other nations of the rampart to extricate themselves from their exposed positions in our military system. Can anyone suppose, for example, that Japan, which is defenseless against atomic attack, would not try to escape into neutrality if we became involved in the kind of war with China that Admiral Carney has described?

It should be, it seems to me, the paramount objective of American policy in this part of the world to create among these threatened peoples the conviction that in friendship with us they will find security—security for their countries and for their own lives. It is essential, indubitably, to guarantee them—as we have done—against external aggression. But this is not enough. It is no less essential to convince them that we shall not be entangled, and that they will not be involved, in wars fought elsewhere and for causes that are not their own.

For weak and virtually defenseless states must be concerned primarily and almost exclusively—as we were for more than a century when we were ourselves a weak power—in their own security. If we fail to understand that about the peoples of East Asia, we shall, as we have been doing, alienate them from their faith and confidence in the future we offer them.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there will soon be before the Senate

House bill 4903, the second supplemental appropriation bill. I desire to take this opportunity to make a very brief statement.

This is the second appropriation bill the Senate will consider this week. In connection with this bill, the Senate owes a deep debt of gratitude to four staff members who labored very late last night, in order that the bill and the report on it could be printed and could be available to the Senate and ready for our consideration today. Without the devotion of these staff members to their duty, it would not have been possible for us to consider this measure today.

The four staff members—key officials of the Appropriations Committee—are Everard Smith, Thomas Scott, Kenneth Bousquet, and Francis Hewitt. They remained at the Capitol until nearly midnight, doing the hard, detailed work necessary to put the bill into shape.

If they have to make any explanations to their families for the late hours, I am personally willing to vouch for each and all of them, because I left the Capitol when they did shortly before midnight.

I do not believe there is any group of staff employees in Washington as able and as hard working as those who are attached to the Senate of the United States. They labor under great handicaps—frequently without what anyone else would consider sufficient time—and it seems to me that they really produce miracles.

Only yesterday afternoon the committee voted to report the bill; and by midnight these staff members had prepared the detailed report on the bill, including all the multitudinous figures which it was necessary to assemble; and the report and the bill were on their way to the printer.

Mr. President, we Members of the Senate can trace practically all our successes, in my opinion, to the splendid work done by the committee staff members. Today, I desire to pay tribute particularly to these four loyal, devoted public servants. Their families and their friends can be justly proud of them, and all of them deserve our gratitude, as well as the gratitude of the American people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished acting minority leader, my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the remarks the majority leader has just made are most timely. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee; and I was present yesterday afternoon when the supplemental appropriation bill was finally marked up, preparatory to printing. It was late in the afternoon before the marking up of the bill was accomplished. The work which had to be done in order that the bill could be before the Senate today—completely printed and in detail—was more than one could possibly imagine, unless one happens to be a member of the Appropriations Committee and sits throughout the detailed, lengthy, tedious hearings which are involved in connection with the appropriation bills.

For that reason, I think the majority leader has not only spoken proper words of commendation for the work done by the staff members, but he has also called to the attention of all Members of the Senate the fact that the staffs of both the Senate committees and the House committees work at virtually all hours on all the tasks we assign to them; and they are certainly to be highly commended for the efforts they always put forth in order to make it possible for the work of the various committees to be completed with thoroughness and in detail, so that the various measures may be brought expeditiously to the floor of the respective Houses, for consideration by the Members.

So, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Texas for having spoken so highly of these staff members, who serve with us daily. I have just come from the room of the Appropriations Committee; and many of those staff members were present again this morning, even though they had worked most of last night to get the work on the bill completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his generous references.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN F. ENDERS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received regarding Dr. John F. Enders, who won the Nobel prize in 1954, and who was one of the important scientists in connection with the development of polio vaccine and subsequent vaccines, the development of which has recently been announced.

I also request to have printed at this point in the RECORD, following the telegram, two articles in connection with the same matter, which were published in the New York Times on April 13. The articles describe the highly-effective work done by Dr. Enders in his participation in these developments.

There being no objection, the telegram and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRFIELD, CONN., April 13, 1955.

Senator PRESCOTT S. BUSH,

Senate Office Building:

Surely the first person to deserve a Medal of Honor for polio and other vaccines is the modest initiator namely, John Franklin Enders, doctor of philosophy and doctor of science, native of West Hartford who is a member of the class of 1919 Yale College, and won Nobel prize in December 1954. Polio and subsequent vaccines should be known as Enders and Salk vaccines, et cetera.

ROBERT P. SHELTON.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1955]

SAFE POLIO VACCINE RESULTED FROM 1949 HARVARD RESEARCH IN GROWTH OF DISEASE VIRUS—STUDIES AVERTED DAMAGE TO BRAIN—SCIENTISTS FOUND TEST TUBE TECHNIQUE THAT OVERCAME OBSERVATION BOTTLENECKS—INVISIBLE DAMAGE SEEN—TISSUE DEGENERATION GUIDED IN DETERMINING WHETHER SERUM HAD ANTIBODIES

The first major scientific breakthrough on the poliomyelitis front came in 1949.

That was the discovery by Dr. John F. Enders and his associates at the Harvard Medical School that polio virus could be

grown in test-tube culture on monkey tissues of nonnervous origin.

Until Dr. Enders' major discovery it had been universally believed that the polio virus would grow only in the nerve tissues of humans and a few species of monkeys.

On the other hand, it was known that vaccines prepared from virus grown on nerve tissue carried the risk of causing severe damage to the recipient's brain, thus producing a disease worse than polio.

The discovery by Dr. Enders and his associates made possible the unlimited growth in test tubes of polio virus that does not carry the risk of any brain damage. This opened the way at last to a safe polio vaccine.

INVISIBLE VIRUS SEEN

In the course of their studies, Dr. Enders and his Harvard colleagues came upon the highly important observation that the polio virus, as it grows on the monkey tissue in the test tube, causes degenerative changes in the cells upon which it grows.

This made it possible actually to see the invisible virus, and thus to tell, by the amount of degeneration produced, the actual rate of the growth of the virus. Absence of cell degeneration meant absence of growth.

Furthermore, the observation provided a quick and easy test to determine whether or not the serum of an exposed or a vaccinated individual contained antibodies against the virus.

Since polio antibodies (immunity factors) check the growth of the polio virus, the addition of the individual's serum to the test tube virus culture would stop the virus growth and hence the degeneration of the cells on which it grows, the serum contained the specific antipolio antibodies.

On the contrary, if the serum did not contain the specific antibodies, the growth of the virus, accompanied by the degeneration of the cells, would continue unabated.

The polio virus is about one millionth of an inch in diameter and cannot be seen even with the most powerful optical microscope. Though it has been photographed recently with the electron microscope, which can magnify objects up to 100,000 times, the viruses thus shown are no longer alive.

Hence, until Dr. Enders and his team made their dramatic observation the only way to determine whether a polio virus was growing was to inject the culture into a living monkey and then wait to see whether the animal became paralyzed. To test for the presence of antibodies also required tedious and costly animal experiments.

BOTTLENECKS ELIMINATED

All these bottlenecks, which would have made the production of an antipolio vaccine on a large scale a practical impossibility, were completely eliminated by the development of the method for growing the virus in test tubes together with the observation that the growth or nongrowth of the virus could be determined by the rate of degeneration of the tissue cells in the test tube.

The progressive destruction of the cells can be observed with the ordinary microscope and serves as a definite visual index of the rate of virus growth: The greater the destruction the more abundant the growth.

Dr. Harry M. Weaver, former director of research for the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, commented that because of the work of Dr. Enders and his Harvard colleagues:

"Today there is no practical limit to the amount of virus that can be produced."

For their epoch-making achievement, which also promises to open the way for vaccines against other virus diseases, Dr. Enders and his colleagues—Drs. Thomas H. Weller and Frederick C. Robbins—received the Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology for 1954.

There were two other major discoveries in the field of polio, in the period between 1948 and 1952, of great importance to the develop-

ment of an effective vaccine against the crippling effects of the disease.

THREE TYPES IDENTIFIED

One of these was the isolation and identification of three distinct types of polio virus. This mammoth project was carried out in four major universities from 1948 to 1951, under grants of \$1,370,000 by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

"The solution of this problem," Dr. Weaver said, "necessitated the monotonous repetition of exactly the same technical procedures on virus after virus, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, for 3 solid years. The number of monkeys utilized in this effort was legion. The physical effort expended by the investigators to cope with the struggles, the dodges, and the antics of this horde of primates is almost beyond comprehension."

After 3 years it was learned that there were three different types of polio virus circulating throughout all parts of the world, each capable of causing paralytic polio in the human being.

It was also found that development of immunity against 1 of the 3 virus types—named Brunhilde, Lansing, and Leon—does not confer immunity against the other two types. This meant that an individual might contract polio more than once.

These findings also meant, of course, that any polio vaccine, to be fully protective, must produce immunity against all three types of the virus.

The Salk antipolio vaccine is therefore a triple vaccine, consisting of a mixture of killed viruses of types I, II, and III. While they no longer can produce the disease, they are still capable of stimulating the blood serum to produce antibodies against them.

THIRD DISCOVERY MADE

The third major discovery—which came in 1952—was that the virus circulates in the blood for brief periods before the onset of the disease. This removed the earlier misconception that the polio virus attacks the nerve cells without previously passing through the blood stream.

Since antibodies are formed in the blood stream as a defense against germs that circulate in the blood, it seemed unlikely that a vaccine would produce antibodies against a virus that bypassed the blood stream altogether.

All previous efforts to find polio virus in the blood stream of animals infected with it had failed. The 1952 discovery of its presence for a brief period in the blood before it passed into the central nervous system, together with the discovery that small amounts of antibodies introduced in the blood prevent the virus from circulating in the system and from paralyzing the animal, provided strong support to the belief that a triple vaccine would neutralize the virus and prevent paralysis.

All these scientific discoveries formed the basis of the vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas E. Salk, of the University of Pittsburgh Medical School, with the March of Dimes funds.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1955]

HARD BATTLE WON BY PERSEVERANCE—DR. ENDERS AND ASSOCIATES TRIED NEW APPROACH AFTER OTHERS HAD QUIT

Dr. John F. Enders, speaking of scientific discoveries, once said:

"The one who places the last stone and steps across the terra firma of accomplished discovery gets all the credit. Only the initiated know and honor those whose patient integrity and devotion to exact observation have made the last step possible."

Dr. Enders was speaking specifically of those who had patiently done the preparatory work leading to the discovery of how to produce the polio virus in test tubes. The last step was accomplished by Dr. Enders and two colleagues, Dr. Thomas H. Weller of the

Harvard School of Public Health and Dr. Frederick Robbins of the Western Reserve Medical School, Cleveland.

For this the trio won the Nobel Prize for medicine and physiology. Now the roles are reversed in the production of a vaccine against polio. Dr. Enders and his collaborators are among those who made "the last step possible" for the discovery of the Salk vaccine.

GUESS WE WERE FOOLISH

Dr. Enders is 58 years old, a crinklyeyed man with a sparse amount of hair and a streak of genius or foolishness, depending on who is describing him, his friends or himself.

Asked what had made him persevere on his Nobel prize-winning quest when it appeared foredoomed to failure, Dr. Enders replied:

"I guess we were foolish."

On receiving the Passano award of \$5,000 in 1953, Dr. Enders quoted his former master, Dr. Hans Zinsser, a famous Harvard bacteriologist, to explain how he had succeeded where others failed:

"It is an erroneous impression that scientific discovery is often made by inspiration—a sort of coup de foudre [thunder clap] from on high. This is rarely the case.

"As a rule the scientist takes off from the manifold observations of his predecessors and shows his intelligence, if any, by his ability to discriminate between the important and the negligible, by selecting here and there the significant stepping stones that will lead across the difficulties to new understanding."

Before he became involved in polio research, Dr. Enders had been working for many years on children's diseases, such as mumps, measles, and chickenpox.

SERVED AS FLIER IN WAR

The famous virologist—he holds no medical degree but a Ph. D. in bacteriology and immunology—was born at West Hartford, Conn., February 10, 1897. He received his A. B. from Yale in 1920, his M. A. from Harvard in 1922, and his doctorate from Harvard in 1930.

He was a marine flier in World War I. From 1942 to 1946 he was a civilian consultant on epidemic diseases to the Secretary of War. For several years he was also on a civilian commission studying virus diseases for the Army.

He first was associated with the Harvard Medical School in 1929 as an assistant in the department of bacteriology and immunology. He became an assistant professor, a position he still holds, in 1942. He also is director of the Research Division of Infectious Diseases at the Children's Medical Center, Boston.

He was president in 1952 of the American Association of Immunologists and he is editor of the *Journal of Immunology*. He is the author of many articles in the field of tissue culture and virus research and the coauthor of two books on immunity and on the multiplication and properties of the polio virus.

Dr. Enders married Sarah Francis Bennet on September 17, 1927. She later died. They had two children, John Ostrom 2d and Sarah. He married Mrs. Carolyn Keane on May 12, 1951.

IMPRISONMENT OF UNITED STATES AIRMEN BY THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the *Record* at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article written by Constantine Brown, which was published in the *Washington Evening Star* of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

REDS STILL HOLD FLIERS—THE 3 MONTHS GIVEN HAMMARSKJOLD TO WIN RELEASE OF OUR MEN IN CHINA HAVE PASSED

While American diplomacy is waiting patiently for the result of the intervention of United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold toward getting our uniformed prisoners out of the Chinese jails, the Internal Revenue Service is less patient. At least one of these unfortunate victims of the Communists has received at his residence in the United States a "reminder" to pay his 1954 taxes and make his 1955 income tax return. Internal Revenue is not to be blamed. The exemptions to the men fighting in Korea were terminated when hostilities in that area were declared officially ended. But there is a somewhat gruesome undertone in this "dunning" by the Treasury men in action.

The country was rightly indignant at the news last November that 14 prisoners in the Korean war, from colonel to private, had been sentenced to long prison terms as spies. There was a loud demand for immediate action to get these men out. It looked for a short time as if our Government would adopt a stern attitude in the face of this total disregard of international law. But some of the timid souls in the administration urged patience and care.

Since the Korean campaign was not a war but a police action undertaken by the United Nations with 95 percent American personnel, it was primarily that international body's responsibility to free our men. Indeed, its highest permanent official, Mr. Hammarskjold, hotfooted it to Peiping. There he was dined and wineed for nearly 10 days by Prime Minister Chou En-lai, had long political talks with the high Communist hierarchy and returned to New York, personally optimistic that somehow or other, some day, our men might possibly be liberated before their prison terms expired.

When the first news of this breach of international law by the Chinese became known, the United States Congress was as angry as the Nation at large. Besides the physical sufferings of those men, it was a new slap in the face at this country. It was suggested in speeches from the floor of the Senate and the House that we demand the liberation of our jailed prisoners, and, if the Communists did not comply, a blockade of the China coast be immediately enforced. This would probably have been done in the days gone by, when we had not become entangled in a complexity of alliances which compel our Government to pay as much attention (sometimes more) to the voices of our allies as to national interests.

The more vociferous advocates of a policy of retaliation, such as Senators KNOWLAND and BRIDGES, were called to the White House where it was explained to them that it would be unwise to precipitate a crisis when the United Nations could achieve our purposes by much more delicate means. There was a tacit understanding that Mr. Hammarskjold be given at least 3 months to show some positive results.

That happened early last January. The 3 months are now over and, as far as this reporter has been able to ascertain, all that the Secretary General of the U. N. has been able to produce was a film showing our jailed prisoners of war in good spirits and healthy playing volleyball.

How accurate is the film taken especially for the benefit of Mr. Hammarskjold it is difficult to say. It is also impossible to ascertain whether the reports that the men are being fed great delicacies such as bird's nest soup and shark fin stew are true. It is more probable that our men are undergoing the

typical Communist brainwashing. The men in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill who have seen this exclusive movie believe that it is nothing more than clumsy Communist propaganda. The Secretary General of the U. N. may have fallen for it, but not the few who have been shown the film.

In any event, after 3 months of negotiations for the liberation of the American soldiers, all that the intervention of the United Nations has been able to produce is a movie.

The administration is unwilling, however, to regard the U. N. efforts as a failure. It urges the advocates of direct and more drastic measures to be patient and tolerant with the tortuous ways of diplomacy. It points out to these advocates that it would be fatal to our interests in the Far East if on the eve of the Afro-Asian conference at Bandung this country were to take any precipitate steps. This, say the spokesmen of the executive branch would have disastrous consequences on our policies of convincing the people of Asia that we are neither imperialistic nor war minded. Let nature take its course, the advocates for American action are being urged. In this manner we shall be given a chance to enforce our peaceful policies of raising the standard of living of the Asiatics and at the same time we shall not run counter to the views of our western European allies who frown on any idea of using power in the Far East.

The fact that the 14 men in Chinese Communist jails—and many others who should have been returned in keeping with the armistice terms—are undergoing the usual Communist mental and physical tortures appears to those who direct our policies of secondary importance, compared to the big diplomatic issues now at stake in Asia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish once again to point out to the Senate that these American airmen are still being held by the Chinese Communists. The Communists admit holding these 15 men. Eleven of the 15 men were sentenced to Communist prisons for terms ranging from 4 to 10 years.

Mr. President, these airmen were shot down over Korea 2 years ago, in January 1953. So far as the 11 airmen are concerned, there is no doubt whatever that their plane was over Korea at the time it was shot down. There was an absolute radar fix on the plane at the time.

The best information is that the prisoners were subsequently taken from North Korea to Communist China.

Mr. President, these men wear the uniform of the United States.

Recently I was privileged to see a moving picture depicting the existence of these men under confinement in a Communist prison. I received no satisfaction from seeing that moving picture.

It is true, apparently, that the prisoners are not hungry and that they are permitted to have some recreation. Apparently they are being given food, at least of sustaining quantity, if not of the best quality. Apparently they are being permitted to write some letters home. I believe it is rather significant that they were not permitted to write such letters until about the time of the Hammarskjold visit to Communist China. Whether the films were made for the purpose of disseminating propaganda by the Chinese Communists is something everyone must decide for himself.

In that connection, I can only say that about 20 years ago I was privileged to

serve in the Legislature of California. At that time I served as chairman of the State committee on hospitals and asylums, and also for a time acted as chairman of the State committee on prisons and reformatories.

In the prisons of California and in the Federal prisons of the United States which I have visited, I have seen better food and more recreation and more liberal letter-writing privileges than are enjoyed by our men who are under restraint in the Communist prisons.

Mr. President, our men are being held contrary to the terms of the Korean armistice. Under the armistice they were supposed to have been exchanged either under the big switch or under the little switch.

Last December the Communists announced that these men had been sentenced to prison terms. It was the decision of this Government to allow the United Nations a reasonable period of time in which to obtain the release of these men.

Mr. President, we furnished 90 percent of the United Nations forces in the Korean conflict. I believe the United Nations has an obligation to take some effective steps to get the men out of Red China. Apparently the Communists have not been impressed by the resolution adopted by the United Nations; neither have they been impressed by the visit of Mr. Hammarskjöld. The men remain there, and they are still in the Communist prisons.

Although I shall discuss this subject more extensively next week, I rise today to ask: What does the United Nations propose to do about it? Has it washed its hands of the situation?

When will Mr. Hammarskjöld make a report to the American people and to the people of the United Nations on the status of these prisoners of war?

When such a report is made, what does the Government of the United States intend to do about it? I do not believe we can continue to let the American airmen serve in Communist prisons in violation of the terms of the armistice without adversely affecting the morale of the men in our Armed Forces.

These airmen have been in prison for 2 years. Will the United Nations wait until these men have been individually brain washed, and, as each one is brain washed and permitted to depart, perhaps serve as an agent for Communist propaganda?

Mr. President, from time to time criticism has been made of men, both civilian and military personnel, for apparently carrying on Communist propaganda after having been brainwashed by the Communists. What can be expected to happen to men who are subjected to the kind of hardships that are visited upon them in Communist prisons? We know that some civilians finally broke down in prison after being kept in leg and arm chains for 4 or 5 years. Strong men of various faiths have broken down under Communist treatment. We do not know all the methods the Communists use on these prisoners.

Mr. President, I believe that we in Congress, who are called upon to pass selective-service legislation and to pro-

vide for the Military Establishment, have an obligation in the case of American service personnel who are sentenced to serve terms in Communist prisons in violation of an armistice agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from California that I completely share the point of view he has expressed with regard to the 11 airmen.

I should like to ask him 2 or 3 questions in regard to the matter, because I shall be surprised if we are not pretty much in agreement in regard to this question. The incarceration of these 11 airmen, in my judgment, is a complete violation of the international law rights of the United States. If we do not stand for government by law under international law, as well as government by law under domestic law, we shall soon lose our standing in the world of nations.

There are also civilian prisoners in China—

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are approximately 30 of them, from the last figures I saw.

Mr. MORSE. I am not too sure how many there are, but I think there are at least 30. I am inclined to think, from the last briefing I have had, that the number is probably more than 30, although the figure may have included the 11 airmen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did some very careful checking on the civilian prisoners, because, as the Senator may recall, in 1952 there was released for the first time a list of the names of the American civilians. The last checkup I had of the civilians was that while a certain number had been freed—I forget the exact number, but perhaps it was as many as 8 or 9—the Communists had also arrested and put in prison 8 or 9 more, so that the figure is still approximately 32.

Mr. MORSE. I will take the Senator's figures, although the figure I had in mind was 53. That figure may include some British nationals. I do not recall at this moment whether or not it does.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If we take the approximate figure of 32 civilians whom we know the Communists are holding, and add to them the 11 prisoners from the one plane about which I was speaking, and the 4 fighter pilots they have admitted holding, we reached a figure which is pretty close to that mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, the Senator and I agree that there are too many. We are dealing with a basic principle of sovereignty, and if we destroy this principle we might as well recognize that we are going to live not in a world of order and law, but in a world of chaos.

The questions I should like to ask are as follows:

Does the Senator agree with me that at a very early date, either in executive session or, so far as I am concerned, in public session—but I shall go along at this time on an executive session—the two committees of the Senate which I think have a vital interest and jurisdic-

tion in this matter, so far as our legislative responsibilities are concerned, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, ought to be advised by the Secretary of State specifically and exactly what the Department of State is doing at the present time to try to get the United Nations to assume what I think is its clear obligation under the juridical processes of the United Nations itself in an attempt to get these men released from Communist prisons?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in what the Senator says. I should go one step further. I think the matter is of such importance that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee should, not later than next week, get together and receive testimony from both the State Department and the Defense Department on the whole question of American prisoners of war still being held by the Chinese Communists, for while they admit to the holding of only 15 airmen at the present time, there is strong reason to believe, from a considerable amount of evidence in the archives of the Pentagon building, that there may be many other American GI's who were supposed to have been released at the time of the big switch and the little switch, who have not been released.

I think it is important that the Senate and the country understand that during the period prior to the Korean armistice and the big switch and little switch there were various letters which the Communists permitted to be sent out of Communist China from prisoners of war, at least purporting to be from them, to their families.

They compiled a list of names. There were certain propaganda broadcasts from Communist China purporting to be in the voices of American prisoners of war directing messages to their families back home. These names were carefully compiled. There were other cases where men who had been released reported having seen certain prisoners at a war camp.

The Communists were supposed to have done one of three things: Either release the prisoners who were disabled or wounded or sick, under the little switch; release the able-bodied prisoners, under the big switch; or return the names and then the bodies of those who had died in Communist captivity.

The difference between the names compiled and those who were delivered back to us represents, roughly, 800. It is entirely possible that the Communists had actually misrepresented the situation, that some of the people had died, and they had other persons purporting to represent them. But it seems to me that Congress has an obligation to clear up this discrepancy, because information has been given to me recently that there is alleged to be a prisoner-of-war enclosure in Communist China which does contain Americans. These matters need to be clarified, and the American people are entitled to the information.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's last remark covers the second of the three questions I intended to ask him. My second question was whether the Senator agreed with me that the situation has

come to such an impasse that we as legislators and as the legislative representatives of the people of our States have a clear duty to find out the facts from our Government in regard to the situation, because we should no longer leave this matter in the secret jurisdiction of the State Department. I think it is now a matter of such concern to all our people that we have the duty of apprising ourselves of the facts about it and then deciding what course of action we should take.

That leads me to my third question—

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit an interruption at that point, as the Senator knows, it was the decision of the Government to proceed in the matter through the United Nations, because United Nations Command was involved. I had no particular objection to that point of view, although I had some doubts as to the procedure followed by Mr. Hammarskjöld, but since he went on his journey and returned in January, we have now had the month of January go by, the month of February go by, the month of March go by, and we are now in the month of April. It seems to me Mr. Hammarskjöld owes a duty to the United Nations as a whole, because there may be prisoners of war from other United Nations countries. We know the Canadians had 1 or 2 men released only recently, men who had been held obviously in violation of the terms of the armistice.

I think Mr. Hammarskjöld should make a forthright report to the United Nations. Then he should either say, "In my judgment, we cannot get these men out by the negotiations I have conducted, and I am recommending a course of action which will put effective steps into motion to get them out." Or he should say, if it is his decision, "I do not believe the United Nations can do anything more effectively. I am not willing to recommend any steps which might be effective. I return the matter to the Government and the people of the United States." But we are entitled to have a specific report on the exact status of the question.

Mr. MORSE. I completely share that point of view. It seems to me it leads to the third question, or, at least, a third possible course of action we might follow, namely, that after we have had a briefing and the presentation of all the facts from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the CIA, then the Senate has the responsibility, it seems to me, of deciding what course of action, if any, we should take in relation to representations to the United Nations itself.

But I happen to be one who shares the point of view that the United Nations is not in this matter living up to its clear responsibilities under the San Francisco charter and the juridical procedures which were set up in that charter. I do not think the United Nations has any right to stand by, to delay, or to allow secret diplomacy to go to work in a situation which involves the lives and welfare of American citizens, and also the citizens of some of the other allied countries, because we know that Canadian and British subjects are confined

in Chinese prison camps. At least, we have been briefed to that effect in times past.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Oregon at this point that I think he has put his finger on a very basic question. The United Nations, by remaining silent now in regard to this clear violation of the terms of the armistice, to which the United Nations itself is a party, will be putting its stamp of approval upon the treating of a solemn agreement as a scrap of paper, and will be tearing down international confidence in any future agreements which might be entered into.

Either these agreements mean something, or they mean nothing. Now is the time and this is the place to ascertain whether such an agreement has any validity whatsoever.

Mr. MORSE. I share that point of view, too. The Senator from California knows the position I have taken on this question. I am perfectly willing to let the record show that it has been my consistent position over the years that if we are really to have a world order based upon a system of international justice through law, then the Government of the United States must in every instance, make it perfectly clear that we will insist on the legal principles of international law being followed by the members of the United Nations, that we will insist that the United Nations bring to account any outlaw nation which refuses to abide by world order under international law. I think Red China is such a nation. I have said so many times in the Senate and elsewhere in this country.

I have just come from a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations considering an incident which occurred in Ecuadorian waters, where I think it is perfectly clear, again, that the international law rights of the United States have been violated. Before the afternoon is over, the subcommittee will release a statement regarding that problem. I merely cite it here because it illustrates again a principle for which I intend to continue to fight so long as I am in the Senate, that is, if we are to have a system of international law, then the body which has the obligation of carrying out the judicial process to enforce that law, namely, the United Nations, must live up to its responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I deeply appreciate the comments of the Senator from Oregon today. While it is true that on a number of issues we do not see quite as eye to eye as we do on this important subject, I certainly welcome his very fine, forthright statement. I hope that coming from his side of the aisle, although formerly he was a member of this side of the aisle, his statement will convey to Mr. Hammarskjöld and to the entire United Nations that in a situation where Americans are being held illegally by the Chinese Communists or by any other group, the United Nations will have to answer to the American people; and that we do not intend, not merely as Democrats or Republicans, but, more broadly, as Americans, to re-

main silent while a single American is being illegally held.

Mr. MORSE. I say "Amen" to the Senator's conclusion. I appreciate his personal remarks; but to his conclusion I say "Amen."

I close by saying that I serve notice that after the investigation or collection of facts has been completed, and if the facts bear out a justification for such a resolution, as I think they will, I shall offer a resolution in the Senate, in the days immediately ahead, which will make perfectly clear, I feel certain, what the position of the United States Senate will be in relation to the United Nations, in respect to its clear duty to use all the jurisdiction it possesses to make certain that Red China shall live up to its clear international obligations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEN. PEYTON CONWAY MARCH

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to announce to the Senate the passing of a great American soldier and patriot—a distinguished son of Pennsylvania—Gen. Peyton Conway March.

General March died yesterday in the Walter Reed Hospital at the age of 90.

Pennsylvania and the Nation mourn the loss of this great military leader, whose brilliant service as Army Chief of Staff in World War I contributed so much to American victory.

General March was born in Easton, Pa., and was appointed to West Point from his native State. He was graduated from the Military Academy as an honor man. His first active combat service came in the Philippines when he took part in the capture of Manila as commander of the famed Astor Battery.

At the beginning of World War I he went to France as artillery commander of the American Expeditionary Force, and in the face of great difficulties he brought that branch of the service up to the highest degree of efficiency.

It was as Army Chief of Staff that his exceptional ability as an organizer enabled him to initiate and carry out a program which landed 2 million men in France.

General March was a dynamic leader as well as a man of great personal courage. Among his many decorations was the Distinguished Service Cross, awarded to him for leading a charge against a strong enemy position in France.

To the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWARD A. HAYES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the other day a friend took his departure. He was a friend to many. I speak of the passing of Edward A. Hayes, formerly national commander of the American Legion.

I know it was written long ago that there is a time to be born and a time to die. Yet in the mystic design of life, the

passing of a noble character is so difficult to understand, at a moment when his dreams of achievement and service are still unfulfilled.

Ed Hayes made no little plans, contrived no small hopes, conjured up no petty dreams. His whole life was in big dimensions because his purposes, his objectives, his devotions were big. It was marked with the finest of moral and spiritual attributes.

In an age when courtesy and good manners have fallen into a state of disrepair, he was an exemplar of these qualities. Why is it important? Because they were a reflection of his kindness and grace of spirit in all things.

He was a humble person. Although great preferment came to him, it was forever hidden in his devotion to great causes. When he was the national commander of the American Legion, his prime concern was the well-being of the disabled, the orphans, the widows, who were the real victims of conflict. When his tour of duty as national commander ended, his interest and devotion carried on without abatement. The time and effort which he gave to this cause, year after year, in a quiet, self-effacing way, was the true measure of his unselfish devotion.

High on the agenda of his concern were the security and well being of his country. In this respect he was a fundamentalist. He knew that a nation was secure only if it was strong, within and without. He knew the strength of tradition. He knew that respect for the Constitution and its preservation was like a never-failing anchor of free government.

For this same reason, he enlisted himself in the struggle against the menace of communism, and fought with unremitting fervor against this insidious evil.

As a student of government, as a lawyer with a keen insight into constitutional processes, as a patriot who knew that liberty was the greatest boon to mankind, he so correctly assessed communism as the arch enemy of freedom and the destroyer of those spiritual values by which men must live. So he became a lifelong crusader in the cause of liberty, knowing that the spirit of the Lord could prevail only where men were free.

Ed Hayes was an unselfish person in the truest sense of the word. When he sought something it was not for the sake of the thing he sought, but only because it was a vehicle for service. As an outstanding national commander of the American Legion, he sought this high post only to serve more effectively the victims of war who were the special solicitude of that great organization.

As an Assistant Secretary of the Navy during World War II, it was not the power and authority which went with that position, nor the lure of the uniform which guided his conduct, but rather the opportunity to serve the Nation whose freedom and benefits he as a citizen was privileged to enjoy.

So Ed Hayes found happiness and exaltation, not in having or in getting, but in giving.

Everywhere in this land there are humble people who will mourn the de-

parture of Ed Hayes because they have been enriched by his living. In one great unuttered song which rings in the hearts of his countless friends, we salute him for the patriot, American, and servant that he was.

We shall recall a favored expression of his as he referred to himself as "Your humble servant," and then we shall realize he was, indeed, a servant of noble causes, clad in the armor of selflessness and humility. Richly has he served and richly deserved is his reward of eternal peace and glory.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires the floor at this time, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the previous order, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate H. R. 4903.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4903, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 6, after the word "control", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$700,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the Senate Appropriations Committee, in connection with its handling of the second supplemental appropriation bill, for providing the funds with which to pay the bills, under the contract authority provisions contained in the Federal Highway Act of 1954, with respect to national forests, national parks, and public land divisions.

I see on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Florida (Mr. Hol-

LAND). He will recall that a year ago at the time when we were conducting hearings on highway legislation, we developed considerable testimony to the effect that there was a great lag between the appropriations made for roads on federally-owned lands and the authorizations which had been made in the several highway acts over a period of years. For example, we found that although we were authorizing the appropriation of \$10 million for roads in the national parks, there was actually being provided in cash, each year, only about \$3,500,000; that although the visitors to the national parks had increased by 10 times from 1945 to 1953, the national parks were getting just about as much money for roads as they received in 1945—or an average of approximately \$3,500,000 a year.

We also found that a similar lag occurred between the appropriations for forest highways and the authorizations of such appropriations, and that that lag was retarding the sale of the timber resources of the Nation.

Growing out of that situation, we decided that the Federal Government should treat its own lands, insofar as roads are concerned, just as well as it is treating the lands of the various States, in connection with road construction. So we proposed that we establish for the roads in national forests, national parks, and for Indian roads on public lands, contract authority which would be equivalent to the authority to proceed under the apportionments for the several categories of Federal aid for the Federal highways. We did that in the Federal Highway Act of 1954.

The first fruition of that is shown in the appropriations now being made. I note with interest the comments made by the several members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as shown on pages 262 and following; and I am glad to see that the Senate subcommittee handling this item has provided the necessary funds, so that these bills will be paid promptly, with the result that the roads on the federally owned lands may be constructed on a par with the road-construction progress in other portions of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 2, in line 6, to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Conservation Program," on page 3, line 2, after the word "law", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That said funds may be used to reimburse the emergency fund of the President authorized by Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), for such funds as have been allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture for payments for the specific purposes authorized herein.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I notice that the

bill calls for added appropriations in the amount of \$938 million. Am I correct in recalling that the first supplemental appropriation bill provided for additional appropriations of \$1,659,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So, with the two supplemental appropriation bills, we are appropriating a total of \$2,597,000,000 more than was appropriated or provided for when we passed the budget, last year; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. These appropriations are above and beyond the regular, annual appropriation bills which were passed prior to the adjournment of the last Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice this bill is termed "the second supplemental appropriation bill." Is it probable that there will be a third supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. There customarily is, toward the end of the session of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then let me ask this question: How much reliance can we place on the claims for economy, which are made after the regular budget is passed, if the figure then stated is increased by means of supplemental appropriation bills, subsequently passed?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are various factors which must be taken into consideration. For example, Congress has voted to increase the pay of the congressional, judicial, and military personnel. Under those circumstances—Congress having thus acted since the adjournment of the last session of Congress—it is now necessary to provide the funds with which to carry out the will of Congress. In other words, the Appropriations Committee can only report appropriations under the authorizations previously made by law. If no authorization is made under a previous law, any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives can make a point of order and thus can prevent the making of such an appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, that I have before me the tabular analysis which appears on page 2 of the report; and it does not give any figures for the Department of Defense, but gives such figures only for other departments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; the third item is blank.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is blank for the reason that we found the Department of Defense had unexpended balances which could be utilized for that purpose. In other words, we inquired diligently, "Did we give you more money than you could spend between now and the end of June?" The reply was, "Yes."

So we said, "Then you can use the unexpended balances to pay these increases."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I should like to point out that the \$938 million being appropriated in conformity with the request of the administration does not include any allowance for the increased military pay voted by the Congress. The amounts appropriated in this bill are due either to the failure of the Budget to estimate properly the actual needs, or to

the fact that after Congress cut the appropriations, the administration has requested additional appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the case of the military pay increase, the situation happens to be that the necessary funds could be transferred from other appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but that will be in addition to the \$938 million.

Mr. HAYDEN. But it is true in this sense: If Congress had not voted to increase the pay, that appropriation would have lapsed, and the money would have been returned to the Treasury on the 30th of June.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But no part of the \$938 million is for the purpose of providing for the increase in the military pay. Approximately \$182 million is for increased pay for the Department of Commerce; approximately \$408 million is for increased pay for the independent offices.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Approximately \$320 million is for increased pay for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those are the large items.

My point is this: Is it not altogether a bad practice—although, unfortunately, a common one—for the administration to claim it has achieved economy by cutting the amounts in the main budget, and then—a few months or a year afterwards—to make requests for supplemental appropriations which increase very grossly the appropriations figure above the amount the administration estimated and stated to the public.

Mr. HAYDEN. That has occurred a good deal in the past; I do not think there is any doubt at all about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also occurring in the present?

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be said, also.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And therefore, are not such claims illusory, extravagant, and ill-founded?

Mr. HAYDEN. Those are very strong terms to use. Nevertheless, there is a certain amount of justification for them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the comment of the Senator from Arizona on this point. I hope he will impress upon the administration the need for thrift and economy.

The administration claims to be cutting the budget. It claims to be working for economy. But after it obtains its appropriations and goes before the country with an economy program, it submits requests for supplemental appropriations which already amount to \$2,600,000,000; and the end is not yet. I think we ought to keep books at the end of a period and not merely at the beginning of a period.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, what the Senator from Illinois has to say can be said about any administration in any year. During the 19 years I have been a Member of this body there have always been supplemental appropriation bills.

It is distasteful to me, as it is to the Senator from Illinois, to have supplemental appropriation bills. I think we should live within our income. But when the Senator from Illinois says that there has been no effort toward economy, he is not accurate. As the Senator well knows, there have been great reductions in appropriations. There have been reductions in expenditures. So far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, it is not very pleasing to him to see some of the departments failing to live within their appropriations; but the situation is not something new. The precedent was established under previous administrations, and the same thing has been happening year in and year out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When this practice was carried on by the preceding administration of my party, I objected to it. But in 1952 we heard that we were to have a change. Sound fiscal principles were to be established. The budget was to mean something. We were not to have supplemental appropriation bills. Expenditures were to be reduced.

Now what do we find? We find the same old song, except that, if anything, the situation is a little worse. I say that it is time for a change.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The situation certainly is not worse. The situation is very much better. Appropriations have been reduced. Expenditures have been reduced. We are operating on a much better basis than has been the case for a long period of time, as the Senator knows. So far as providing funds to meet deficits is concerned, supplemental appropriations are just as objectionable to me now as they were under the previous administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May we have the cooperation of the distinguished senior member of the minority on the Appropriations Committee in turning the heat on the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments to see that in the future estimates are honest estimates, and that the program of supplemental appropriations is not continued?

Mr. BRIDGES. I suppose we shall always have some supplemental appropriations. However, so far as turning the heat on is concerned, I shall certainly do my part, as I have done in the past.

I point out to the Senator, as he looks over the various items, that with respect to certain items, when reference is made to an increase by the Senate committee over the House—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not been attacking the increases by the Senate committee. I have been attacking the practices of the administrative departments in not accurately forecasting what their demands would be and thereby giving a false impression to the country. I have no criticism of the Senate committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think perhaps I interrupted the Senator from New

Hampshire. I was waiting to have him pledge his cooperation in getting the administration to follow sound business practices.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am always looking in that direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I am inclined to agree with his statement that perhaps the time has come when some heat ought to be turned on someone to reduce appropriations and expenditures. I fully agree with the Senator from Illinois that the practice of submitting requests for supplemental appropriations leaves a false impression with the American people to a certain extent. However, the way to correct that situation and the way to put the heat on, is not to request the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Arizona to put the heat on the administration. We have the votes in the Congress to do the job. All we have to do is to vote down the requests, and that does the job automatically. That will put this administration, or any other administration on proper notice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Delaware think also that the votes of Senators and the votes of the people of the country might have some effect?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that certain appropriations ought to be cut. However, I still say that there is no use criticizing the administration downtown and then voting for appropriations. I do not say the Senator has been doing so, but I do say that so long as Congress votes appropriations we cannot criticize the administration for spending them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand that the Senator intends to vote against the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I intend to vote against many of the items. Some of them can be justified. We must approach each item on its merits. However, I think the practice has gone too far. In the past perhaps both administrations to some extent have claimed many things which have not been delivered. However, I believe that the proper way to approach the problem of lower expenditures is by our votes here in the Senate.

Let us not overlook the fact that in many instances these supplemental appropriation requests represent funds required by bills we have recently passed. For instance, while I voted against the 10 percent salary-increase bill it passed, and we will now be required to appropriate next year nearly \$1 billion extra to meet the added cost. That bill was passed by the Senate over the administration's recommendations.

Again, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the time to balance our Federal budget is long overdue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Delaware for his characteristically honest statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do wish to raise a point with the Senator from Arizona regarding the advisability of discussing the bill at all today. The bill was not available to any Member of the Senate until 11 o'clock today. No Senator except the members of the committee had an opportunity to see it. I have great confidence in the Appropriations Committee, but I think it is a bad practice to consider appropriation bills such as this in the Senate without letting them lie over at least 1 day as required by our rules. I did not happen to be in the Chamber at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was made, or I should have objected to it. However, now that the agreement is in effect, we must be governed by it. It is provided in our rules that appropriation bills should be printed and allowed to lie over at least 48 hours so that Members of the Senate can take them home and examine the different items. I think it is only fair to Senators, who must vote on such bills, to give them that opportunity. I wonder if we can have some assurance from the chairman that this situation will not occur again.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I believe that our rules should be followed in the case of major appropriation bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This bill carries appropriations of \$950 million. That is a major item where I come from. I think it is a major item everywhere.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yesterday the Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill, calling for appropriations of over \$3 billion, was passed. That bill was likewise taken up by unanimous consent without Senators having had an opportunity to study it in advance.

I serve notice now that I will not consent to such unanimous-consent agreements again in connection with appropriation bills. I would not have consented to the present agreement yesterday had I been in the Chamber.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator has made a proper recommendation with respect to the major appropriation bills. However, so far as the Treasury and Post Office bill is concerned, those departments must operate, and only rarely is there any controversy over the appropriation bill for their appropriations. The same situation applies with respect to supplemental appropriation bills. However, when it comes to large appropriation bills, covering a multitude of subjects, I think Senators should have the time to study the bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The appropriation bill passed yesterday carried appropriations of more than \$3 billion. Today's bill carries appropriations of approximately \$1 billion. Four billion dollars is a great deal of money. With all due respect to the committee and to the departments, Senators cannot vote intelligently on the various items unless they have an opportunity to study the bills in advance.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator from Delaware. I think he is entirely correct. I also agree with the Senator from Arizona, that in the future we should live up to our rules. I may say to the Senator from Delaware, as well as to the distinguished chairman of the committee, that, as the ranking minority member of the committee, I have received several complaints from other Senators who have made plans, and who would like to be present during the consideration of the bill, because they are particularly interested in certain items. I believe that if we allow the practice now being followed to become general, we shall get into an unfortunate situation, and create ill feeling. In addition, it is not good legislative procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The rule specifically provides that bills must lie over for 3 days. That rule has a constructive purpose. The purpose is to allow Members of the Senate an opportunity at least to examine the bills. In this particular instance I was unable to obtain a copy of the bill or the report of the Appropriations Committee until after 11 o'clock today.

I hope the chairman of the committee will assure us that in the future we shall be given proper notice.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have already given such assurance to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, beginning in line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 4, to insert:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act," to remain available until expended as follows: Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J., not to exceed \$110,854; to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of amounts heretofore appropriated for "Claims, Federal Airport Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board—Payments to Air Carriers," on page 4, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$15,200,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment? Why is this increase justified?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who handles the appropriation for the Department of Commerce, to explain the item.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Board is making an effort to bring to a more current basis its payments of the subsidies to air carriers provided under the law that Congress passed.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he commends the Civil Aeronautics Board for trying to put this matter on a more current basis. The other members of the Committee on Appropriations felt the same way about it. We feel that we should hold up the hands of CAA in its manifest effort to

bring its business practice to a sounder basis by paying audited and earned items which are due commercial air carriers at an earlier date than they have been paid formerly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment is not an increase in the overall expenditure. The subsidies being paid to the airlines have been decreased. The purpose of the amendment is to make the expenditures on a current basis. In other words, the bookkeeping of the Board will be on a more current basis than it is at the present time. That is the whole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota is, of course, exactly correct. The size of these items depends upon the law, and we passed the law. The items are not passed for payment until they have been audited. Each claim is audited. The Civil Aeronautics Board is seeking to bring its accounts with the carriers on a more current basis. It is the judgment of the Senator from Florida that it is sound business practice, and he believes that we should commend the Board and go along with it in its effort to bring its accounts on a more current basis.

The same situation will arise later in the bill when we reach the consideration of the Maritime Commission payments. In fact, this prompt payment would be a more honest practice. It prevents airlines from piling up interest on money borrowed until their claims are paid; this, in the final analysis, must be paid by the Federal Government. As a rule, the interest paid on loans made by carriers are made at a much higher interest rate than would be the cost if the Federal Government were borrowing the money.

The amendment would promote sound and honest business practice by bringing these payments to a more current basis than has been the case up to now. The Senator from Florida believes—and he believes every other member of the Appropriations Committee also believes—it is a good practice to have these accounts brought up to date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps these questions would have been answered in my mind if we had had time to read these explanations. However, we did not have that time granted to us. Are not all the claims audited by the Comptroller General and approved by him prior to their being paid?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are all audited and approved.

I should like the RECORD to show, too, what was stated by Mr. Gurney, who testified for the Civil Aeronautics Board. Senators will remember that Mr. Gurney was an able member of this body some years ago. I quote from his statement, which will be found at page 233 of the Senate hearings:

Under the rates on which the current estimates are based the average ton-mile yield for service pay and subsidy combined for all carriers, both domestic and international,

declines from \$1.19 in 1954 to 97 cents in 1955.

We feel the Board is doing a good business job in not only reducing the rates, but also in insisting on bringing the accounts to a more current basis.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The airlines are doing an exceptionally able job. Their deficiencies are less, and they are operating almost within their earnings. The Federal Government's subsidies now and in the future promise to be less than they have been in the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 4, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maritime Activities—Operating-Differential Subsidies," on page 4, line 21, after the word "subsidies," to strike out "\$35,000,000" and insert "\$60,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that item?

Mr. HOLLAND. This item also comes from one of the agencies which on its regular budget request would be handled by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Florida is the chairman. These operating differential subsidies are paid under the authority of title VI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. They have been consistently determined on a basis designed to place American shipowners on a par with their foreign competitors insofar as certain direct vessel operating costs are concerned. This principle of parity acknowledges the fact that since cargo rates of American operators, the source of income, must be competitive with those of foreign operators which have much lower costs of operation, the American operators could not continue to maintain scheduled services without a means of offsetting the considerably higher costs.

Mr. President, that result flows from the law which we passed in an effort to keep our merchant marine alive. The reason for the increase for the current year is exactly the same as the one stated a while ago for the CAB.

It is an attempt by the agencies to bring their accounts to a more current basis. The accounts have been audited, and they are ready for payment. The Senator from Florida asked the Administrator of the Maritime Administration, if we made this allowance, whether we would find later that we had appropriated more than the Commission needed. I warned him, if that were the case, we would not be apt to look with much favor on a recommendation of this kind in the future.

He stated categorically that these amounts would be needed, every penny of them. He said he was trying to reduce the carrying time and the carrying over of these accounts. He specifically brought out the fact that when late payments of subsidy caused borrowing the interest paid was added to the operating costs, so that subsidy payments increase.

He stated, further, that the operators' loan interest rates were not good, and that we would be building up heavier claims, which the Federal Government would have to pay, by allowing these obligations to run so long.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware—and I am glad that he is interested in this item—that every member of the Appropriations Committee felt with respect to this matter just as all of us did with respect to the other matter which was handled a few minutes ago when we dealt with the CAB, namely, that the effort to handle these items in a more businesslike way is to be commended. We should do all we can to help bring these accounts on a more current basis and eliminate the unsatisfactory interest charge, and the unsatisfactory added operating expenses, which are occasioned by carrying these accounts unpaid for as long as 2 or 3 years, as has been customary in recent years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I understand the Senator correctly, the reason why some of these accounts have been carried 2 or 3 years or even 5 years is that they have been pending in the courts. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is true with respect to some of them, but it is not true with respect to many others.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask this question, then?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to call the Senator's attention to page 5 of the committee report, where the following statement appears. This is the view of the full committee, as I understand, and I heard no dissent from this sentiment.

It is the opinion of the committee that when there exists an obligation of the Government incurred in accordance with law with members of the public, Congress should not take any action to abridge the payments due by failure to provide the funds fully to satisfy debts as promptly as payments can prudently be made.

We think that is sound law, sound judgment and good business, and we stand on that. We expect to find the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who I believe is one of the soundest businessmen in this body, to approve that approach.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the committee on that approach. However, I wanted to make sure that this item had been examined. The reason we are forced to ask these questions from the floor is that the report from which the Senator from Florida has read, was not available to the other Members of the Senate until about 2 hours ago. It is impossible for us to read that report now. The only way in which we can get the information is by asking some of these questions.

I should like to ask whether any part of the \$60 million requested is to be used in payment of any claim which is now pending before the court and whether all claims included in this item have been audited and approved.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that this item applies only to claims which have been audited and are ready

for settlement. I refer the Senator to two quotations which may be found on page 25 of the work slips.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course we do not have the work slips available. The other Members of the Senate do not have the work slips available. However, I should be very much interested in hearing the quotations read by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. What I am about to read is a quotation on pages 285 and 288 of the hearings, which have been printed and which I believe have been available to the Senator for quite a while.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; they have been available.

Mr. HOLLAND. The item on page 25 of the work slips is the same item as will be found on page 288 of the printed hearings.

This is a quotation from Mr. Rothchild, recently appointed and now serving as Under Secretary of Commerce:

We owe the money and will owe the money by the end of this year. We have stepped up our administrative program to the point where we now have only a 3-month voucher processing backlog, where we formerly had a 6-month backlog.

As was indicated to your committee on previous occasions, we had hoped to do just that, and we did get it done, and we need every bit of the money.

As we stand today, for example, we have vouchers on hand as of today for just over \$35 million, so that if we would get only the \$35 million which was authorized by the House committee, we would be out of money as of today.

The other statement was made by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which I now read:

Chairman HAYDEN. I might state that a representative of the General Accounting Office says they have examined the records, vouchers, and the basis for estimating the requirements for the second supplemental, 1955, for operating-differential subsidies, and have found that the estimate is well founded on the basis of the United States payments due to provide for prompt settlement of three-fourths of the amount earned for the third quarter of fiscal 1955. Provided the shipping lines submit vouchers in time for completion of examination by Maritime Administration, the payment should be expected to reach \$125 million this year.

Mr. President, I should like to advise the Senate of this fact. The distinguished chairman of the committee and other members of the committee, the ranking minority member and some of the junior members of the committee, remained here during the Easter recess in order to have the bill ready to report to the Senate. There has been not only no unnecessary delay, but I have been particularly impressed, as a new member of the committee, with the care displayed by the distinguished chairman, the distinguished ranking minority member, and other members, in insisting that on any point of difficulty the opinion of the General Accounting Office should be had, and on any point where such action was necessary it should simply be put over and come up in the annual bill which is yet to be considered.

I wish to say that I have been impressed by the way these items have been worked out, and I am sure the commit-

tee as a whole—I believe it is unanimous—is on sound ground in commending those agencies, some of which I have mentioned, for putting their operations on a businesslike basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I certainly do not want my questions to be taken as any criticism of the committee, but we cannot get away from the fact that the committee does not have the power to legislate. That power is in the Congress. The committee does have a responsibility under the rules of the Senate to make the information available to us and give us ample time to examine it. I am not criticizing the committee, but we have a perfect right to have access to the reports and to have an opportunity to read them overnight before we are asked to legislate. I think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator, and I appreciate his kind comment with reference to the committee, and particularly with reference to the chairman. When this bill was marked up and reported yesterday, it was understood that it would come up on Friday or later. I do not know what happened on the floor to hurry up its consideration; that was not the expectation of the Appropriations Committee. I assumed it was worked out between the leadership of the two parties on the floor and with the presence on the floor of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who is always in his seat. I do not believe there is any Member of the Senate who is more earnest than he in attendance on the sessions of the Senate. The plan was changed after the bill was reported.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was one time when I was caught off the floor. If I had been present and a unanimous-consent request had been made for the consideration of the bill, consent would not have been given.

Are we to understand that the General Accounting Office has already approved the allowance in the amount of \$60 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand the General Accounting Office has approved it. I understand there was more than enough already fully audited and ready for payment on the day of our hearing to have taken up the whole amount allowed by the House, and that the audits are moving ahead rapidly. It was realistic of us to increase the amount allowed by the House to permit the carrying out of the excellent planning of the Federal agency, which wishes to keep more current in its payments than has been the case heretofore.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I just wanted to make the point at this time that perhaps I should have objected to the consideration of the bill today. I did not do so. I point out to the Senate, however, that last year and in other years when I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I was many times harassed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators as to whether or not we were acting within the

rule. Sometimes I would have to look up at the clock and say, "This bill was reported at 1:05 on Tuesday," for instance. The Senator from Illinois was very particular, and I had to live up to the rule. Perhaps I was a little at fault in not registering an objection when the Senator from Delaware was not present and some other Senators were not present.

I should like to read the rule. It is section 139 (a), and it reads as follows:

No general appropriation bill shall be considered in either House unless, prior to the consideration of such bill, printed committee hearings and reports on such bill have been made available for at least 3 calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered.

That is very plain and specific, and I think that in the future we should live up to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate that statement from the Senator from New Hampshire. I do not believe there is anything in this bill of an emergency nature.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I assume the bill could have gone over an extra day. But I am reminded by the clerk of the committee that at least four agencies are now completely out of funds, and they need the enactment of this measure in order that they may meet payments which are now due.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is exactly the point I am making. These agencies came before the Congress last year and outlined their needs for a full year. Only 8 months have passed and now if any agency is at a point where it is out of money completely if the bill is not passed today, I think it would do it good to go without a pay check or two. Under the law each agency is supposed to budget its expenditures.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida—

Mr. HOLLAND. May I make this comment just before the Senator asks his question. Undoubtedly some of the Senator's comment is properly placed against some of the items, although I cannot name them. But there are many items in the bill against which his comments would not properly lie. There are three items in the bill relating to the construction of roads and highways for which we gave contractual authorization and on which the work has been done and on which payment is due. The work was done under our specific direction. Probably one of the largest single items has to do with the meeting of the costs of recent legislation passed by the Congress applicable to the Defense Department. The Senator will recall that the total amount, running up, as I recall, to more than \$300 million—the record will speak for itself as to that—had to do with transfers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, particularly the Army and Air Force, to take care of both incentive pay and retirement pay made necessary by legislation which we voted this year and which could not have been included in the budget.

So although I am very certain that the remarks of the Senator from Delaware may be very properly directed to some of the items in the bill, I must say that

the larger items in the bill would not be subject to those remarks, because they represent either funds due for the carrying out of contractual authorizations or funds needed because of changed law, which has been enacted during this session of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct; but, by the same token, neither of the two cases he mentioned—and perhaps others which I believe are in the bill—would have been affected in the least whether the bill were passed today, tomorrow, or Monday.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is probably correct in that statement. By the time the actual transfer or payment of funds had been made, probably 24 hours would not have made much difference. But certainly if the members of the committee had not stayed in Washington during the Easter recess and prepared the bill for early action, there would have been delays which would have been hurtful.

I think the Senator from Delaware will recognize the fact that the committee—especially its distinguished chairman—has been diligent in the matter. Whatever the reasons were that animated the leadership on the floor to move up consideration of the bill from Friday to Thursday should not be chargeable to the committee, which reported the bill with the distinct understanding that it was to be acted upon on the floor tomorrow—Friday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I concur in the statement by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

I wish to proceed with the question of the \$60 million item. I notice in the report that the amount comes out as exactly \$60 million. Certainly there must have been a breakdown somewhere, because, if I read correctly, the cash deficit as of January 30, 1955, was \$19,530,533. The estimated amount of additional vouchers for the last quarter of 1954 and the first quarter of 1955 comes to \$40,469,447. That includes the estimated \$20 million for 1955. The figure comes out as an even \$60 million for the three quarters.

There must have been some breakdown. I wonder if the committee had such an estimate furnished to it. I notice in the hearings that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] raised the same point, that a General Accounting Office report or breakdown was not available to the committee, and he suggested that one should be obtained. Did the committee obtain such a breakdown?

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee obtained such a breakdown.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is my point. I wanted to be sure it had been obtained. I did not see it printed in the hearings, and I wondered if the committee received such a breakdown from the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HAYDEN. We did.

Mr. HOLLAND. A later expenditure statement was furnished. I think the Senator from Delaware will find, by perusing the hearings, that the members of the committee had the same feeling as does the Senator from Delaware, that the matter should be substantiated by a

breakdown which would be worthy of belief by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know the committee took the same position at the time, but I did not find it in the report. Evidently, the report came after the hearings had been printed. I merely wanted to be certain that such a breakdown had been furnished.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am advised by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], that such a report was furnished and was considered by the committee.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his interest. I am glad he is concerned about these matters. He will find the Senator from Florida equally concerned. But in this instance I think the committee, which worked with such diligence to prepare the bill, is not to be charged with the fact that the bill is being considered today, on only 1 day's notice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With respect to payments to shipping companies of the amounts which are certified by the General Accounting Office as being due them, are the payments made to a company which might at the same time owe the Government money? Or would such payments be withheld in such a situation?

That is, if there should be an outstanding claim by the Government against a company, would the money due the company be withheld until the claim was settled?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am advised by the clerk of the committee that in contested matters of the type which the Senator from Delaware has mentioned, the agency is now withholding, and will continue to withhold, payments. At present \$125 million is so withheld, which amount is not included in the amount provided in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wished to make certain that Congress would not be authorizing payments of claims to companies against which the Government had claims.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am able to advise the Senator that our information from the agency is that it withholds money to cover such matters, and does not approve such claims for payment, and that they are not included in the items covered by the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

REPAIR OF RESERVE FLEET FACILITIES

For expenses of repair and installation of mooring facilities and restoration of cathodic installations at reserve fleet locations, \$970,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Repair of Reserve Fleet Vessels (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)," on page 5, line 11, to strike out "\$225,000" and insert "\$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$40,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for Reserve Fleet expenses is increased from "\$6,460,000" to "\$6,860,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads—Federal-Aid Highways," on page 5, line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Highways," on page 6, line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Lands Highways (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)," on page 6, line 10, after "(68 Stat. 73)", to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Defense—Civil Functions—Department of the Army—Canal Zone Government—Operating Expenses," on page 6, at the beginning of line 26, to strike out "\$230,000" and insert "\$338,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Defense," on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

CLAIMS

For an additional amount for "Claims," \$4,320,000, to be derived by transfer from "Military personnel, Navy," fiscal year 1955.

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay," \$8 million, to be derived by transfer from "Military personnel, Navy," fiscal year 1955.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

For additional amounts for the following appropriations of not to exceed the respective amount stated:

"Claims," Department of Defense, \$4,320,000;

"Retired pay," Department of Defense, \$22 million;

"Military personnel, Army," \$150 million;

"Military personnel, Air Force," \$110 million;

the foregoing amounts under this head to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation only during the fiscal year 1955 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the senior Senator from Illinois mentioned some of the increases in the supplemental appropriation bill. Apparently, he did not fully realize that the Committee on Appropriations has no discretionary authority to ignore some of the legislative mandates of the legislative committees which are contained in bills approved by Congress.

At this point I wish to call attention to the fact that although funds in the

amendment currently before the Senate are authorized transfers within the Department of Defense and call for no additional funds, a large share of the increased operating expenses is the direct result of the so-called Career Incentive Act of 1955, which was approved by Congress in March of this year.

At that time probably little attention was paid by Members of the Senate to the various provisions of the Career Incentive Act. One of the provisions increased the retirement annuities resulting from that direct mandate. I wish to point out that for the last 3 months—the final 3 months—of this fiscal year, the estimated cost of the increased retirement annuities is in excess of \$14 million; and that for the fiscal year 1956 the estimated cost is \$56,308,000.

When the increased retirement costs are added to the amounts for the Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, the cost for the last 3 months of the present fiscal year will be \$15,820,000, while the estimated cost for fiscal 1956 will be \$63,487,000.

I emphasize the fact that the Committee on Appropriations had no discretionary authority to withhold funds which are necessary to implement the provisions of the Career Incentive Act.

I am calling attention particularly to the increased retirement annuities, because probably very few Members of the Senate knew in March, when the career incentive bill was before this body, that very extensive increased costs would result specifically from increasing retirement annuities, allegedly to stimulate interest on the part of enlisted men in making a career of the armed services.

It is difficult for me to rationalize the substantially increased retirement annuities for officers in the grades of colonel and general as having a direct effect in encouraging and in influencing privates to make a career in the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the remarks which I made earlier on the supplemental appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief summary dealing with increased retirement annuities resulting from career incentive legislation.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increased retirement annuities resulting from career incentive legislation

	Estimated cost, Apr. 1-June 30, 1955	Estimated cost, fiscal year 1956
Army.....	\$7,570,000	\$30,280,000
Navy.....	4,769,000	19,076,000
Marine Corps.....	395,000	1,580,000
Air Force.....	1,343,000	5,372,000
Total Defense.....	14,077,000	56,308,000
Coast Guard.....	1,700,000	7,000,000
Public Health.....	33,000	140,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....	10,000	39,000
Grand total.....	15,820,000	63,487,000

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Foreign Operations Funds Appropriated to the President—Mutual Security—Contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance," on page 9, line 2, after the numerals "1955," to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Export-Import Bank of Washington—Limitation on Expenses," on page 9, line 15, to strike out "\$1,110,000" and insert "\$1,140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Independent Offices," on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION
SURVEYS, PLANS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 20, to strike out:

CHAPTER XII A

ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

SEC. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary access facilities over or under public streets and such other appurtenant or necessary facilities as may be approved by such Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 14, to insert:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
EXPENSES, GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

For an additional amount for "Expenses, general supply fund," \$258,000, to be derived by transfer from "Defense public works, community facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to insert:

SOO LOCKS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION
COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Commission in preparing, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 19, 1949 (63 Stat. 620), a comprehensive plan for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the building of the Soo Locks, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, and transportation and not to exceed \$20 per diem in lieu of subsistence for members serving without compensation, \$21,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VII—Department of Labor," at the top of page 14, to insert: UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, \$13 million, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," on page 15, after line 6, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
ASSISTANCE TO STATES, GENERAL

The limitation under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personal services, is increased from "\$2,400,000" to \$2,418,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert:

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; \$125,000, to be derived by transfer from "Retired pay of commissioned officers," fiscal year 1955.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," on page 16, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "\$79,400,000" and insert "\$80,640,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 14, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services," \$28,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IX—Department of State—Salaries and Expenses," on page 17, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 14, to insert:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1955 shall be available for additional contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, as authorized by the act of August 31, 1954 (Public Law 736), in an amount not to exceed \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Contingencies," on page 18, line 3, after the word "contingencies," to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration—Salaries and Expense, United States At-

torneys and Marshals," on page 18, line 10, after the word "marshals", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Judiciary," at the top of page 20, to insert:

**COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$13,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries of Judges," on page 20, line 9, to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$914,500." The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter X," on page 21, after line 6, to insert:

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS**

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 10, to insert:

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses," \$1,100,000 to be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction and improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 15, to insert:

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay," \$584,000, to be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction, and improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 19, to insert:

RESERVE TRAINING

For an additional amount for "Reserve training," \$46,000, to be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction, and improvements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 6, to insert:

**THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$63,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—District of Columbia," on page 22, after line 12, to insert:

OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL

The limitation of \$10,000 for the settlement of claims not in excess of \$250 each in accordance with the act of February 11, 1929, as amended, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, is increased to \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

OPERATING EXPENSES

METROPOLITAN POLICE

The appropriation for "Metropolitan Police (additional municipal service, American

Legion Convention)," contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available for payment at basic salary rate for services performed from August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive, by members of the uniformed force of the Fire Department in excess of their regular tour of duty (but not to exceed a total of 12 hours overtime pay to any individual member performing service within such period).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 4, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

For an additional amount for "Department of Public Health," \$650,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 7, to insert:

PUBLIC WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Department of Public Welfare," \$152,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to insert:

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For the payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500 65 Stat. 131), \$23,008.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 20, to insert:

JUDGMENTS

For the payment of final judgments rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Congress), \$10,587, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 3, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS

For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1952 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Congress), \$155,095, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest on audited claims for refunds at not exceeding 4 percent per annum as provided by law (act of July 10, 1952, 66 Stat. 546, sec. 14d).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XII—Legislative Branch," on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS, AND SALARY AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

COMPENSATION OF SENATORS

For an additional amount for "Compensation of Senators," as authorized by Public Law 9, 84th Congress, \$320,001.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 11, to insert:

COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

For an additional amount for "Compensation of the Vice President of the United States," as authorized by Public Law 9, 84th Congress, \$1,667.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 16, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the office of the Secretary, \$3,905, to be available, effective April 1, 1955, for the compensation of one director of photography, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of \$5,100 and one laboratory technician, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of \$4,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 26, to insert:

Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an additional amount for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$140: *Provided*, That effective April 1, 1955, the basic rate of compensation of the chief cabinetmaker shall be \$3,540 in lieu of \$3,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 5, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, \$3,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 9, to insert:

Furniture: For an additional amount for materials for furniture and repairs of same and for the purchase of furniture, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 12, to insert:

Miscellaneous items: For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items," exclusive of labor, \$51,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 14, to insert:

Packing boxes: For an additional amount for "Packing boxes," \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 16, to insert:

Postage stamps: For an additional amount for "Postage stamps," for office of Secretary, \$115.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 18, to insert:

Notwithstanding any provision of law, service heretofore or hereafter performed as an employee of the Republican senatorial campaign committee or the Democratic senatorial campaign committee shall be considered for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to be service as an employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers and employees made eligible for the benefits of such act by the act of July 13, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "House of Representatives," on page 17, after line 6, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Clerk: For the employment effective April 1, 1955, of an administrative assistant to the Coordinator of the Joint Recording Facility, at the basic salary rate of \$4,800 per annum; a film librarian, at the basic salary rate of \$2,500 per annum; and a secretary, at the basic salary rate of \$2,220 per annum in lieu of \$1,500 basic per annum, \$3,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Capitol Police," on page 27, after line 21, to strike out:

Capitol Police Board: For an additional amount, \$3,420.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Capitol Police Board: For additional amounts for "Capitol Police Board," as follows: fiscal year 1954, \$21,139; fiscal year 1955, \$38,972.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds," on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings," \$16,000, of which \$12,500 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Capitol Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination, including related architectural treatment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with respect to page 28, line 19, which provides for an additional amount for the Senate Office Building, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate and the chairman of the committee that the bill has a very broad authorization for the House of Representatives to build a new office building and to acquire land and property for the expansion of facilities for use of House Members. I think it is perfectly proper that should be done, and I am in favor of it. However, I wish to point out that finally, after some years, we have started on a new Senate Office Building. I think we made one great mistake about it, however. I do not think we have acquired the necessary property in the area, much of which is slum property, to provide for adequate parking facilities, for proper approaches, or for anything of the kind. I wonder if the chairman of the committee will express an opinion on that subject and give some consideration to it, so that we may approach the problem more on the basis on which the House is approaching their problem.

Mr. HAYDEN. The suggestion was made during the consideration of the pending bill that something of that kind ought to be done. Of course, there is great merit in the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire. We did not have time to go into the question in a proper way. I am quite sure the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations will look into the matter very carefully when it comes to report the regular bill.

There is no question about the situation which is going to develop in that regard; which, as a matter of fact, has already developed. Parking space is at a tremendous premium, even if no other use could be found for the property. I think also it would be well to own such property for the protection of the building. I think it would be well to have the building some distance away from other buildings. There is merit in the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is suggesting that perhaps in the consideration of the regular legislative appropriation bill that matter could be considered. At that time the problem might be approached as the House has approached it here. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is chairman of the subcommittee, will give consideration to that question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make another statement. I know I am looking quite a bit ahead when I say this and that some people will scoff at the idea, but 2 or 3 or 4 years ago we authorized about \$65 million for the United Nations to build a modern building in New York and we provided a substantial sum of money for that purpose. Many Members of this body have visited the capitals of other countries of the world, some of which we have been helping for years and some which we have been helping more than others and many of them have magnificent parliamentary buildings. There is hardly a person who will not say that the Capitol of this country is a historic institution, but, in my judgment, it is becoming rapidly obsolete for the proper functioning of the Congress of a great country of 165 million people. That time may not come in the life of those presently in the Senate, but some thought should be given to the idea of acquiring property in this vicinity so that a new modern capitol of the United States may be constructed, in which the Congress could function efficiently and capably, at which time the present Capitol of the United States could become a great historical monument, such as Mount Vernon is today. It would be an historic shrine to which many people could come. I am very sincerely of the opinion that the time will come, but I do not know when.

My only point in raising the question at this time is that, if that time should come, such a new capitol should be constructed near the present Capitol of the United States, where we do have the Senate and House Office Buildings. Some thought should be given to acquiring the property necessary when that necessity arises. I realize that tomorrow someone may severely criticize me for mentioning this, but we must look ahead. I am sure that no one who has been in this building for any length of time will deny that it is difficult to function efficiently in our present building as should be the case in a government of a great country.

Mr. HAYDEN. I concur in what the Senator from New Hampshire has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 17, to insert:

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

For an additional amount for "Senate Office Building," \$43,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 20, under the item "Senate Office Building," it is proposed to strike out the amount "\$43,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "\$53,000", and add thereafter a comma and the following new language, "of which \$10,000 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Senate Office Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I might state that the lighting system in the Senate Office Building was designed for the use of direct current electricity. It is being changed to alternating current, and therefore a different kind of equipment will be required. Just what kind of equipment it will be, we do not know, but it will be necessary, in order to obtain efficient lighting in the offices of Senators, to make some study of what lighting system is needed for their use and the use of employees who work there. The object is that such a study should be made as promptly as possible, so that when the regular legislative appropriation bill shall be under consideration, there will be definite information which can be submitted with regard to working out the changeover from one kind of electrical current to another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment on page 28, after line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 20, to strike out:

CHAPTER XII A

ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

Sec. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary access facilities over or under public streets and such other appurtenant or necessary facilities as may be approved by such Commission.

Sec. 1202. (a) If the site upon which the building authorized to be constructed by section 12A (1) of this act is not within the United States Capitol Grounds as defined in the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regu-

late the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C. secs. 193a, 193m), the Architect is authorized to acquire such site by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and upon acquisition of such site and completion of the building, such building, and the grounds, sidewalks, and facilities surrounding it, shall be subject to the provisions of (1) of the act of May 4, 1907, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 175) (relating to the control, supervision, and care of the House Office Building), and (2) the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., sec. 193a, 193m).

(b) Any proceeding for condemnation brought under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619-644).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 1203. For carrying out the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated \$2 million, to remain available until expended; and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 1204. This subchapter may be cited as the "Additional House Office Building Act of 1955."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 14, to insert:

CHAPTER XII A

ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

SEC. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary equipment, such necessary connections with the Capitol Power Plant and other utilities, such necessary access facilities over or under public streets, such other appurtenant or necessary facilities, such changes in the present House Office buildings and mechanical and other changes necessitated thereby, and such changes in or additions to the present subway systems, as may be approved by such Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 1202. (a) The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, such publicly or privately owned real property in the District of Columbia (including streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys, or parts thereof) located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Grounds as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission for the purposes of section 1201 of this chapter or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any street, avenue, road, highway, alley, or part thereof, acquired pursuant to this subsection shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor

made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the House Office Building Commission. Square numbered 636 in the District of Columbia (which is now part of the new House of Representatives Office Building site) shall be available for the purposes of this chapter. Any real property owned by the United States and located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds shall upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the House Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol without reimbursement or transfer of funds. At such time or times as may be fixed by order of the House Office Building Commission, (1) any real property acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter shall become part of the United States Capitol Grounds and subject to the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., secs. 193a-193m, 212a, and 212b), and (2) the building and all facilities constructed pursuant to section 1201 of this chapter shall become subject to such act approved July 31, 1946, and to the provisions of law relating to the control, supervision, and care of the House Office Building contained in the act approved May 4, 1907, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 175).

(b) Any proceeding for condemnation brought under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619-644).

(c) When any real property has been acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to provide for the demolition and removal as expeditiously as possible of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 1203. For carrying out the purposes of this chapter there is hereby appropriated \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be determined by the House Office Building Commission to be required for the purposes of this chapter: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of such Commission is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 1204. This chapter may be cited as the "Additional House Office Building Act of 1955."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XIII—Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments," on page 34, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 25 and"; and in line 11, after the

word "Congress", to strike out "\$6,269,842" and insert "\$9,504,219."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "School-lunch program," \$7,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, this amendment is being offered to meet the requirements in Oklahoma and several of the other States for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the State Board of Education in Oklahoma, describing the acute emergency which has arisen there.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 21, 1955.

HON. ROBERT S. KERR,
Senator, Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KERR: I have been notified by Harvey Allen, legislative chairman of the American School Food Service Association, that the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended a drastic cut in the Federal school-lunch appropriation and a \$25 million increase in the special school-milk program. Since the School Lunch Division is responsible for administering both programs in Oklahoma, I would like to advise you of status of the two programs in this State.

The maximum allowable reimbursement under the National School Lunch Act is 9 cents per meal. The average payment in Oklahoma is 4½ cents. In spite of reducing the rate to that low figure, we will be unable to pay any reimbursement for the month of May this year and possibly only 75 percent of April.

On the other hand, the procedure set up to administer the special milk program is so unrealistic we will have a balance of unexpended funds, totaling \$600,000, which will have to be returned to Commodity Credit Corporation. You can readily see that the programs are working conversely for the children of Oklahoma.

As you know, the extreme drought in this area has caused much unemployment—those on relief rolls approximate 200,000 and the need for schools supplying free meals in many cases reaches 40 percent of enrollment.

If the proposals made by the Secretary of Agriculture are adopted, it will seriously impair the health of the schoolchild in Oklahoma.

We would appreciate anything you can do to aid us in this cause.

Very truly yours,
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
DREW V. LANGLEY,
Director, School-Lunch Division.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a telegram signed by my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and myself, addressed to Mr.

Howard Davis, acting director of the Food Distribution Division, Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1955.

MR. HOWARD DAVIS,
Acting Director, Food Distribution Division,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Please advise at earliest convenience status of school-lunch fund for reimbursement of States which are, like Oklahoma, running short of funds for months of April, May, and June. Also furnish rate of reimbursements each of these States and other information in line with telephone conversation your office today.

ROBERT S. KERR.

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY.

MR. KERR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, of the Department of Agriculture, dated April 13, 1955, setting forth the answers to our questions, and also a table showing a list of States expected either to reduce the level of reimbursement payments or to cease reimbursement payments to the participating schools for the latter part of the school year, and also reimbursement rates paid as of January 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1955.

HON. ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KERR: This is in reply to your telegram of April 6 to Howard P. Davis of our Food Distribution Division, requesting information as to the status of school lunch funds in those States which may expend the balance of their funds at existing reimbursement rates prior to the end of the school year.

At the beginning of each fiscal year the funds appropriated for the operation of the national school lunch program are apportioned to the States in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act. The States are then advised of the amounts that will be available for cash reimbursement to participating schools during the fiscal year. These funds are advanced to the States on a quarterly basis and the State agencies are encouraged to budget these funds so as to maintain assistance to participating schools throughout the school year. The fourth quarterly payment in the amount of \$10,360,397 was made to the States the first week of April.

Cash payments to the schools are made on the basis of a specified rate of reimbursement for each meal served. The rate of reimbursement for individual schools is determined at the beginning of the school year and is made a part of the agreement between the State agency and the school. In making this determination, States must estimate the number of meals that will be served during the year and establish the level of reimbursement in relation to the amount of funds available. This means that any increase in participation not anticipated by the State will result, if no adjustments in rates are made, in exhaustion of funds prior to the end of the year. (During the current year participation increases in many States have been higher than normal and the program nationally is reaching about 11

million children, as compared to 10.1 million last year.)

In most cases, the States review their funds situation after midyear and make necessary adjustments to bring the monthly rate of expenditure in line with the total funds available. In other instances, States prefer to maintain the rates without change, with the result that funds are exhausted before the close of the school year. The latter situation is likely to occur in a number of States this year. However, it should be recognized that commodities purchased with funds appropriated for the national school lunch program as well as surplus foods continue to be available to the individual lunch programs, and that most schools arrange to continue lunch program operations despite the curtailment of cash payments.

We are enclosing a list of States whose current rate of expenditure is likely to result in exhaustion of reimbursement funds prior to the end of the school year, or will mean that sharply reduced rates of reimbursement will be paid for the last 2 or 3 months of the year. This situation occurs for at least a few States each year, but has been more pronounced this year because of a greater than usual increase in program participation.

Sincerely yours,

ORVIS V. WELLS,
Administrator.

NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

List of States expected either to reduce level of reimbursement payments or to cease reimbursement payments to participating schools for the latter part of the school year and reimbursement rates paid as of January 1955:

State:	Reimbursement rate ¹ (cents)
Arizona ²	3-9
California.....	4
Delaware.....	5
Georgia ²	3-6
Idaho.....	4½
Indiana.....	5
Iowa.....	4
Michigan ²	4-6
Minnesota ²	1-5
Mississippi.....	7
Missouri.....	5
Ohio.....	5
Oklahoma ²	3-7
South Carolina.....	5
Tennessee ²	3-8
Vermont.....	9
Washington.....	4
Wyoming ²	4-6

¹ Prevailing rate as of January 1955.

² Variable rates paid in relation to need.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to state, for the benefit of my colleagues, that this matter was not brought to the attention of the committee before it made up the bill. Therefore, all the knowledge we have regarding the necessity for additional funds to carry out the school-lunch program is embraced in the letter the Senator from Oklahoma has inserted in the RECORD, as the letter had come from the proper authorities. If the references contained in the letter are correct, certainly some additional funds should be made available.

Whether the exact amount the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to have made available is the proper amount under the circumstances, I have no way of knowing. All I can say is that, after consultation with the other members of the committee, we have agreed to accept the amendment, take it to conference, and then obtain such further information as may be necessary in order to adjust the matter satisfactorily and properly.

MR. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona. I wish to say to him that we did not get word of this shortage and this crisis until after the committee had completed its hearings on the bill, or otherwise we most certainly would have presented the matter to the committee at the hearings.

On behalf of my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], myself, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who has joined us in submitting the amendment, we wish to express our sincere and keen appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee, to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and to the other members of the committee who have indicated their willingness to take the amendment to conference and there, to the extent that they feel it necessary, check on the amount which is being included in the bill at this time, and for this purpose.

MR. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. MONRONEY. I desire to express my deep appreciation to the Senators who have agreed to take the amendment to conference. We regret that the emergency was not disclosed until after the hearings had closed.

When we consider that more than 1 million school children are now participating in the school-lunch program, and when we further consider the vast areas affected by drought or by freezing weather, which have most seriously affected various parts of the country, and in some cases have caused more than 40 percent of the school children to have to rely upon Federal participation in the school-lunch program, because of a lack of food in the families of those children, I believe it will be realized that the amendment is a most worthy and deserving one. So I greatly appreciate the willingness of the members of the committee to take the amendment to conference for further study.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. BRIDGES. I do not wish to throw any cold water on the amendment, but I think we should understand all the facts in connection with it.

To begin with, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has told us that the information came in too late to be presented to the committee. He is correct. Of course, the fact that it was not presented to the committee is bad practice, because all these items should be brought before the committee, and evidence should be submitted. However, the Senator was not informed in time to enable

him to present the proposal to the committee. We understand the situation.

The Congress was very generous last year in connection with the school-lunch program. I agree with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the school-lunch program is one of the best programs we have in this country. Perhaps the money spent in connection with it is put to as worthwhile use as would be possible in connection with any program. I have always been for it, as most of my colleagues have been.

However, there is an obligation on the part of the States, when funds are allocated to them for the school-lunch program, so to budget the funds they receive that they will cover the entire school year. Some States must have done so, and some States must not have done so. The States which must not have done so are today in the condition described.

While I feel sympathetic toward the States facing the situation which has been described, nevertheless, I point out that it is not exactly fair to the States which are properly budgeting the funds and are living within their estimates in connection with the school-lunch budget.

I am not raising a point of order, as I told the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and his distinguished colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I would not. I understand that what they are doing is trying to protect the school-children of their State. It is not my purpose to oppose their proposal today. However, I think the facts should be known, so that we may avoid getting into such a situation again.

Earlier in the day I was taken to task, as was the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is against all supplemental appropriation bills. Apparently he has forgotten that we had supplemental appropriation bills over the years when the administration of his party was in power. Apparently he has forgotten that last year he compelled the Senator from New Hampshire to abide strictly by the rule in connection with appropriation bills.

Apparently the situation as to school lunches is the result of some unforeseen happening, on the one hand, or the failure properly to budget on the other hand. As the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] pointed out, there are more school children participating in the school lunch program this year than were included in it in the previous year. The total number of children participating and the number of schools taking part may have been unequally distributed among the various States. Perhaps that is one reason for the budgeting plan being thrown out of balance.

Nevertheless, in connection with a situation such as this, I think we ought to give warning. The Senator from Arizona has indicated his willingness to take the item to conference. We certainly should give warning, by this debate, and by the expressions not only of the Senator from New Hampshire, but the Senator from Arizona and the two Senators from Oklahoma, that next year the States should live within their bud-

gets, and that the funds should be so budgeted as to cover the entire school year, unless some unforeseen emergency occurs. Otherwise, we shall be extending an invitation to other States to do the same thing next year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think there is great force in what the Senator has said. It is true that there have been excessive droughts in certain parts of the United States, and there have been freezing conditions in other parts of the United States, which have seriously interfered with the local economy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In looking at the figures this morning I noted that in the 1955 budget there was \$85 million plus for the school lunch program, but that the estimate for 1956 is only \$68 million. As I remember the footnotes—and I am drawing on memory now—there will be an unexpended balance from the 1955 appropriation which will be available for 1956. While I have not examined the figures which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has presented, it occurs to me, from those figures, that a certain sum of money would be available. How much, I cannot say without going into the subject a little more thoroughly.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the House committee has increased the sum to \$83 million, which was the appropriation last year. That is above the budget estimate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am only pointing out what the budget estimate for 1956 is, as compared with the actual appropriation for 1955.

Mr. HAYDEN. I accepted the amendment with the distinct understanding that we would look into it very thoroughly in conference. We realize that there have been droughts in certain parts of the country, and freezing conditions in other parts. There have been unusual circumstances affecting certain States. We will go into the subject very thoroughly. That is all the assurance I could give the sponsors of the amendment.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4903) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN,

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

SEIZURE OF AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS BY ECUADOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the consultative subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee met in executive session this morning with Mr. Sheldon Mills, United States Ambassador to Ecuador; Mr. Rollin S. Atwood, Director of the Office of South American Affairs of the Department of State; and Mr. Fred E. Taylor, of the Office of the Undersecretary of State.

Ambassador Mills and Messrs. Atwood and Taylor gave the subcommittee a detailed account of the seizure of the American fishing vessels *Arctic Maid* and *Santa Anna* by an Ecuadoran naval ship on the high seas off the coast of Ecuador March 27. An American citizen, a member of the crew of the *Arctic Maid*, was wounded during the incident. The vessels were taken to Guayaquil by the Ecuadoran Navy and subsequently fined on charges of violating fishing regulations which the Ecuadoran Government has promulgated to cover waters 200 miles from the coast. At the time they were seized, the fishing vessels were between 25 and 30 miles from the coast.

Ambassador Mills has been recalled to Washington for consultation with the Department of State, which takes a serious view of the incident.

The subcommittee shares the Department's view regarding the gravity of the case and expects to follow developments with deep interest.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make for the benefit of the Senate.

On Monday next it is planned to take up calendar No. 131, Senate bill 500, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and for other purposes.

In addition, I should like to inform the Senate that when we conclude the consideration of the upper Colorado River project bill, it is planned to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 127, Senate bill 651, introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], commonly known as the feeder airline bill.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO JUDSON KING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the many friends of Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, and a grand old warrior for the people, are planning the annual celebration of his birthday on April 29, to wish him many more fighting years.

If more people knew all that Mr. King has done for them, his modest home near Washington would be snowed under with messages of congratulation. He, at least as much as any other man, pioneered the long battle against the private-power monopoly and brought to millions of city and farm folks the blessings of cheap and abundant electricity. In spite of many handicaps, he has continued his studies, his research, his generous cooperation and advice to many who come to him for guidance, and his stimulating and effective bulletins and magazine articles. He has also made headway with his history of the origin of the TVA—a definitive study so urgently needed for current guidance of Dixon-Yates activities and for historical purposes in future protection of the TVA and all it means to the American people.

Recently, in one of his bulletins, Mr. King turned his attention to the propaganda campaign directed against Nebraska's "Little TVA." With his usual skillful marshaling of facts, he has brought into sharp focus the relationship between the attacks on Nebraska's 100-percent public-power system and the Dixon-Yates contract, the proposed issuance of revenue bonds to expand TVA, and the tremendous costs of flood damage which could be eliminated by integrated development of all our great river systems.

Mr. President, as a birthday tribute to Judson King, and in order that it may be widely circulated, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the revised edition of his bulletin numbered 254.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT NEBRASKA'S "LITTLE TVA"—ITS RELATION TO THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT, NATIONAL POLICY, AND THE QUESTION OF REVENUE BONDS

The crux of it—electric power

1. In 1926 (sic) Ottawa, capital of Canada, served by Ontario Hydro, was the first city to achieve an average residential rate of exactly 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

2. In 1954 Chattanooga, Tenn., served by the TVA, was the first city in the United States to achieve exactly 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

3. The cities of Nebraska, the Pacific Coast, and elsewhere are on the way, and many are close to 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

4. The slogan of the REA Co-ops on the front cover of the NRECA's official magazine is "Electricity for every farm" at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

In 1954 private rates in different sections ranged from just above to 3 or 4 times as much. But you cannot float oceans of stock and make large profits on 1 cent current. That is what the conflict is over.

Flood control and the taxpayers

1. The Weather Bureau and the United States Geological Survey estimate that the

total loss from major floods alone in the United States from 1902 to 1951 was 3,989 lives and \$4,744,878,370 of property.

2. The Corps of Army Engineers estimates that from 1898 to 1954, inclusive, Congress has appropriated about \$4 billion for flood control which has prevented damage of about \$7 billion. Yet, annual flood damages still total around \$600 million.

3. No one has yet produced a figure of the scores of millions spent in the last 25 years, say, by Congress for flood relief.

4. But the Red Cross estimates that from June 1947 to April 1952 it has spent for relief from major floods alone in the Columbia, Missouri, and upper Mississippi Rivers, and in New England, a total of \$20,755,845.

The bitter test of 50 years proves that in addition to soil conservation, etc., great reservoir dams, like Hells Canyon, are necessary to forestall major disasters. Yet, the Platte, the Tennessee, and the Lower Colorado alone are harnessed, due to the political opposition of the power trust. The crux here is, shall the taxpayers foot the bill for flood protection and be cheated out of the low-cost incidental power?

I. THE ATTACK UPON THE NEBRASKA SYSTEM

Long before and during the hectic conflict over the sensational Dixon-Yates contract the American public, by pamphlets, press, and radio, has been deluged by a flood of falsified history as to the origin of TVA and gross misrepresentation as to its financing and concrete benefits to the South and to the Nation.

And now comes a renewed attack upon the genesis of Nebraska's "Little TVA," so-called by Senator Norris in his effort to aid businessmen and farmers to establish multipurpose river development and public power in his home State.

When the Tennessee Valley business and professional men attend national conventions, or the folks visit their folks in other States, they are frequently criticized and treated as charity patients or dupes of "Red" schemers and are told, "We are paying for your cheap power in our taxes." And recently came a volley of facts from Nebraska to dispel myths about that project. Two newspaper articles will illustrate my point.

"Nebraska consumers are the only losers"

The Tulsa World, largest newspaper in Oklahoma, on November 18 last carried an article by Ray Tucker, veteran Washington newsman whose syndicated column appears in many dailies over the country, which left readers with the impression that Nebraska's Public Power System was the illegitimate child of an unholy alliance between Wall Street stock gamblers and New Deal politicians in the 1930's with the result that "Nebraska consumers are the only losers."

"Thanks to the advent of public power"

But on December 26 the Omaha Sunday World-Herald featured a story by its staff writer Harold Cowan of a sharply different character. It was based on an extensive factual study made by Mr. George E. Johnson, Hastings, chief engineer of the Central Nebraska Power and Irrigation District of the benefits to the State of the public system's 20-year experience. It emphasizes the many millions of dollars saved to farmers and all other users of electricity "thanks to the advent of public power."

It is this sort of thing that is causing fair-minded people everywhere to exclaim in despair "Whom and what can we believe."

In his scintillating book "Why Not Survive?" just published in New York, by Simon and Schuster, Michael W. Straus, former militant United States Commissioner of Reclamation, charitably terms vendors of falsehood regarding efficient conservation of our water resources "Apostles of Reaction and Yearners for Yesterday." The bunkum

circulated about the Nebraska project comes from the same sources.

Now, during the last generation it has been charged that the TVA was a super-State, forced upon the southern people by Washington bureaucrats, depriving them of their independence. Millions believe it, and the same tale has been vended as to Nebraska and Bonneville. The result is to disrupt and wreck or delay needed 20th century progress in river development. Hence, the truth about Nebraska becomes important, and the major part of this bulletin will be devoted to who created it, why, and how.

The first fact for the reader to hold in mind is this: The movement which resulted in this project was started by Nebraska businessmen during the Hoover administration—before the New Deal was born.

II. ORIGIN OF THE NEBRASKA PROJECT

According to the Tulsa World story, the mastermind back of President Roosevelt's multipurpose power policy was the late Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, who, in the Nebraska affair, worked hand-in-glove with a Wall Street stock salesman—a mysterious individual, unknown to the public, Guy E. Myers. With the aid of pressure brought by Ickes, as charged by Tucker, Myers was able to force the sale of the Nebraska Power Co. to the city of Omaha, netting for himself a nice commission of \$530,000. Since it is well known that Myers negotiated the purchase of the remaining 14 private companies in the State, a like sellout is to be inferred. Inflated prices were paid by the public, and as a result of this political blackmail on the part of Ickes, Nebraska consumers are the only losers, as before noted.

The Boren investigation of 1945

As authority for his account of the origin of the Nebraska project and Mr. Myers' part in it, Tucker quotes from a House speech by Representative Lyle H. Boren, Democrat, of Oklahoma, on July 6, 1945, which requires our attention. At that time Myers was acting as agent for the citizens of Omaha in negotiating the purchase of the Nebraska Power Co., and the outcome was in doubt. In addition, the Murray bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority, and the Mitchell bill, to create a Columbia River Authority, had been introduced and were under discussion in Congress. Both involved the extension of TVA power policies which Wall Street was determined to block—as it still is in 1955.

In his speech, Boren asserted the existence of a plot to turn the entire private electrical industry of the United States—then pegged at \$18 billion—over to public ownership. He charged that Wall Street bankers and manipulators had discovered a loophole in the Holding Company Act of 1935 by which they could purchase, with Government cooperation, the stocks of private companies and sell them at grossly inflated prices to public bodies and reap millions in profits.

Said he: "The Marxians care not how high the price so they attain their end. The bankers care not how they foul the nest of capitalism if they can turn an 'honest penny' * * * The stakes are high! This bonanza is bigger than the Credit Mobilier, the Whiskey Ring, and it dwarfs the swag of Teapot Dome." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 6, 1945, pp. 7329-7330). He should have added that all 14 private companies in the State outside Omaha had already been purchased.

An investigation by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce followed in which Myers and others were questioned by Boren. The charge of a gigantic conspiracy was not sustained and was promptly forgotten, but it served a temporary political purpose.

What actually happened

In briefest brief, the Nebraska system had its origin in the efforts of three separate groups, composed of prominent business and

professional men, stockmen, and farmers, to rescue the State from disastrous results of the depression which followed 7 years of drought. They were not public-ownership men. But they had faith in the teachings of the great conservationist Dr. G. E. Condra of the State University.

These men went into action right after the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was signed by President Hoover on January 22, 1932, in order to secure Government aid and money to start useful projects which would prime the business pump and relieve unemployment. A majority were stalwart Republicans. Some even thought Senator Norris was a radical dreamer. At the same time they urged the passage of a State law permitting them to form multipurpose districts. It was signed by Gov. Charles W. Bryan on April 18, 1933.

The account given of Secretary Ickes' part in this charge is a baseless canard. I had a part in this 12-year war over the Nebraska project and can state from personal knowledge as well as by the documents that Ickes was by no means the mastermind of the New Deal power policies. He was opposed to the Nebraska project, just as he was to Bonneville and Coulee, but was overruled by President Roosevelt. The idea that he was in "cahoots" with Guy C. Myers is absurd.

The first group at Columbus, located in the eastern one-quarter of the State where rainfall is normal, sought to build a power plant on the Loup River, a tributary of the Platte. Here the late Harold Kramer was the outstanding leader.

The western three-quarters of the State does not have normal rainfall, droughts are disastrous and irrigation with waters from the Platte River and elsewhere from deep driven pumps necessary. Hence, the second group, at Hastings 80 miles farther west, proposed to start a power and irrigation project to help out in that region. At this point the leader was Dr. D. W. Kingsley, son of the pioneer of the project.

The third group, at North Platte 150 miles still farther west, also desired power and irrigation. Their leader was Hon. Keith Neville, banker, stockman and ex-Governor.

By the time engineering plans had been prepared and applications for loans reached Washington all such matters had been transferred from the RFC to the Public Works Administration, of which Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes was Administrator. Presently the three separate groups came into collision, not with "bureaucracy" but with sound investment needs and modern engineering.

Birth of the unified system

It was doubtful if these individual projects would pay out. PWA could make a "grant" of 30 percent for relief, but the remainder would be a loan which the promoters thought they could pay by selling water and power to private companies.

A Power Board was created in PWA, consisting of Dr. Clark Foreman, K. Sewell Wingfield, engineer, and J. D. Ross, engineer of Seattle City Light. These men worked closely with George E. Johnson, above quoted, and other Nebraska engineers and came up with a new comprehensive plan which would serve Nebraska's needs as a whole and repay Uncle Sam.

In short, they recommended the building of a great reservoir dam on the Platte River near Keystone in west central Nebraska (now Kingsley Dam) which would hold the entire river flow plus floods in the spring, and generate power. Said they, in effect: Connect your three hydro projects with a transmission network and you will have flood control, irrigation water the year around and 500 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy to serve your farmers and municipalities. It is now called "The Hydros" for short.

Ickes headed the wrong engineers

Senator Norris approved the plan, but Ickes, trusting the advice of his old style engineers that there would be no market for that amount of power, refused PWA money to finance it. He appointed another board, headed by Dr. Ellwood Mead, Commissioner of Reclamation (for whom Lake Mead at Hoover Dam is named), but this board also approved the plan, Roosevelt ordered it, and these are the alleged "Reds" responsible for the State's generating and transmission system.

It was not "put over" by Ickes. On July 1, 1939, this project and others were transferred to the newly created Federal Works Agency, with John M. Carmody, Administrator, and Alan Johnstone as Chief Counsel. They were friendly and assisted the three hydro districts in working out a joint agreement so they could operate as one unit, called the Nebraska Public Power System. Later Mr. Johnstone suggested and wrote the legislation by which Congress reduced the interest rate from 4 to 2.5 percent—because private companies were then themselves borrowing money at the lower rate.

Purchase of the private companies

The multipurpose plan decided upon, its managers faced the problem of marketing 500 million kilowatt-hours of power. Private companies declined to cooperate and J. D. Ross advised the hydros to purchase them and do it by negotiation instead of by the long, expensive, and uncertain method of legal condemnation, essentially as TVA bought the Tennessee Electric Power Co. in 1939. Senator Norris agreed.

Employment of Guy C. Myers

Ross recommended the employment of Guy C. Myers to negotiate the purchases. He had employed Myers to market \$6 million of revenue bonds in Wall Street to build the power plant at the Diablo Dam for Seattle City Light after Ickes had turned him down. Hence, he had confidence in Myers' ability and integrity.

Now note the terms: If Myers failed he would get nothing. If he succeeded he would get an average commission of around 2 percent, as against the customary 5 percent for private work. He would pay his own expenses. Valuation of the properties would be superintended by Ross, the actual work being done by R. W. Beck and Associates, Ross' former aid at Seattle; a firm of able analysts and engineers, still working for the Nebraskans.

Preliminary work started in June of 1937, but in 1939 Ickes still denied PWA funds, whereat the hydros made a bold move. On August 5, 1939, they organized, under State law, the "Consumers Public Power District" to buy out companies and market the power generated and transmitted by the hydros.

Actual purchase of scattered private companies began in 1940 and by October 13, 1943, all 14 companies outside Omaha were bought for a grand total of \$40,750,000. The Nebraska Power Co. at Omaha was purchased on December 2, 1946, for \$42 million and Nebraska became a 100 percent public power State—the first.

Fees. Testifying at the Boren hearings, Mr. Myers stated that for 10 years' work his fees totaled \$1,328,000 in purchasing the 15 companies, which included the \$430,000 for the Omaha deal, and his total expenses were \$652,500.

So, the Nebraska districts paid Myers a fee of 1.6 percent for purchasing \$82,500,000 worth of utility properties. But if he had done the job for a New York holding company, say, at the customary private fee of 5 percent it would have yielded him a gross of \$4 million, probably at less expense and there would have been no hullabaloo about it.

Evidently resentful over false rumors which made boobs of responsible men, Mr. T. H.

Maenner, a leading businessman who, with George Ashby, president of the Union Pacific Railroad, was a member of the Omaha citizens committee which made the purchase of the Nebraska Power Co., requested to be heard. He informed the Congressmen, emphatically, that without Myers' aid they could not have made the purchase as soon as they did, if at all; that they were satisfied with his fee and the price paid; that the whole deal had been on the up and up, and had saved the city \$2 million the very first year. (See House committee hearings, 1945-46, vol. 1110, pp. 735-782. For Myers, p. 743; for Maenner, pp. 767-782.)

Benefits to the State and the Nation

I have no space for ample statistics, but there is overwhelming evidence of what the wholly owned and managed 100-percent public multi-purpose river system is doing for the State; the same as TVA is doing for Tennessee. Vast areas of arid lands have been and are being put into production through irrigation, just as worn out and eroded southern lands are redeemed by soil conservation. Hundreds of new industries have started in cities and towns, which means a balanced economy. The Platte River flood menace is gone.

The key to all this is low-cost power. Engineer Johnson reports 95.6 percent of farms electrified with an average cost of power of 3.1 cents per kilowatt-hour, as against 11 cents in 1935 with only 8.3 percent of farms electrified.

In 1935 Nebraska's total bill for power for all services cost 3.44 cents per kilowatt-hour. In 1953 it cost 1.8 cents with a 500-percent increase in usage.

Mr. Johnson further demonstrates that if Nebraska's power bill for 1953 had been paid for at 1935 private rates it would have cost \$61,955,000 more. Of course he makes no claim of a like comparison as against present-day rates since they are lower, but the figure gives us something to think about, especially when we remember that about one-half of the State's power (all of Omaha) is generated by steam.

IV. TAXES AND FINANCIAL STABILITY

But "Do they pay taxes?" They do. Mr. Johnson assures us they do, exactly as the companies did. Making inquiry, State Tax Commissioner F. A. Harrington sent me the 1953 report. Pages 120-123 reveal that the system paid in lieu of taxes the total sum of \$1,010,912.50, which went to the State, counties, cities, villages, townships, and schools, the schools getting nearly half of the total.

"But is it a financial success?" Well, John D. Dawson, of 25 Wall Street, N. Y., financial counsel for the enterprise since 1939, laid down the cold facts in an article in the Daily Bond Buyer of July 22, 1953, which recounted the history up to January 1 of that year, from which we glean such items as these: The system had spent \$122 million on new plant to anticipate the rapidly growing demand, of which \$44 million came from revenues; redeemed \$23 million of its debt; paid \$10 million in State and local taxes; and was a \$202 million going concern which has saved consumers \$24 million in reduced rates as against private rates charged when the companies were acquired from 1940 to 1946.

Regarding the tax scarecrow this cool, level headed Wall Streeter who knows his onions, tartly reminded the public that:

"It would seem that utility companies do not pay taxes in the same sense that you pay your taxes out of income which would otherwise be available to meet your bills. Utility companies are nothing more than tax collecting agencies, since their net income is unaffected by the amount of taxes they pay. The consumer actually pays the taxes instead of the owners of the company."

V. WHY NEBRASKA IS IMPORTANT

Having cleared the air of myth and smog let us now summarize the chief values of this unique experiment to national thinking on river development.

1. A clean-cut honest pilot plant: Although Tennessee is a close second, Nebraska is the only other State in which a public superpower system can demonstrate how low rates to consumers can ultimately go, provided it is freed from competition with, or dangerous partnership entanglements with, private power companies.

2. Revenue bonds: Its experience in financing its distribution system with revenue bonds should be of value since Congress is soon to consider revenue bonds as supplementary to the existing right of Congress to appropriate money, or the TVA to use earnings to finance new construction.

3. Integration: Nebraska is demonstrating what a unified system will do for a valley. It needs to be integrated with an entire Missouri River system, of which it is a part, as provided in the Murray bill. That great region can then anticipate the results following the TVA example, as set out in former Chairman Gordon R. Clapp's lectures last year, now available in book form from the University of Chicago Press. And James Dahir's book, *Regional Building*, just published by Harper's, pictures for us the dividends of health and happiness 6 million people are enjoying by utilizing the opportunities made possible to them by TVA.

SIXTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, this date is one of particular interest for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It marks the celebration of that providential day 65 years ago when the association which just became the Pan American Union, and later the Organization of American States, was established. The Western Hemisphere stands as a proud example of what mutual understanding, respect, and confidence may achieve in the creation of a system to preserve the peace. It is a system which does not depend for its effectiveness exclusively or even primarily upon the imposition of superior force, but whose greatest influence comes from those qualities of restraint, tolerance, patience, and solidarity, all combining to create a tremendous reservoir of public opinion that few governments can truly ignore.

Thank God that it is so. Thank God that the Inter-American system is not a yoke cast upon any of its members by any brutal or oppressive power, against the will of the member. Within the voluntary, free system, each republic is the equal of any other; each government is entitled to get and receives the same respect as any other government. Its paths are the paths of mutual self-interest, not the paths of fear and oppression.

The Organization, which was invigorated at Bogotá, goes about its duties so unobtrusively and unobtrusively that not many of our people are aware of what it does. It rarely gets the prominent headlines which have been enjoyed so often by the Security Council of the United Nations. Its deliberations

have not been overcast with the presence of dignitaries whose utterances sometimes provoked uneasiness and concern in the chancelleries of the world.

Instead, quietly, without fanfare, but with patience, dignity, firmness and the tactful competence of the OAS representatives, it has been steadily laying the foundations of a more harmonious society in the Western Hemisphere. Thoughtful men recognize this. They remember earlier days, when the promise was not so bright. I recall, during the stormy, but short-lived history of the League of Nations, that the Pan American was rather disparagingly discussed by men who should have had greater vision, as a rather futile, ineffectual organization of little promise.

But the League has gone, and in the ensuing years, the Pan American Union and its Governing Board have evolved into a solid and respected force for the maintenance of peace in the Americas. And all this, without disproportionate voting rights in any member, no matter how powerful, and without the veto.

I doubt that such a development would have been possible without the many years of preparation and of discouragingly slow progress. It underscores something we are perhaps prone to forget. Instruments of this kind cannot be forged overnight. In the area of inter-governmental cooperation, the progress must be slow, sometimes aggravatingly slow; but no progress at all is possible without a common groundwork of mutual good will and a neighborly concern that views the needs and aspirations of one as a common problem of all.

On this great day, then, let us resolve to do all we can to strengthen this free association, to keep it alive, and as a part of this effort, to assist our fellow Americans in the Western Hemisphere to meet and overcome the economic and social obstacles to a rich and better life for their peoples.

I am sure that on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations I express the good will of the American people to all the peoples of the Latin-American republics when I say that we join them today in doing honor to this long period of mutual respect among the republics of both hemispheres.

TRANSPORTATION OF LIVE SCORPIONS IN THE MAILS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 35, Calendar No. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was unable to be present on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon because of my attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore, I

was unable to ask for the consideration of the pending bill at that time.

The bill is identical with a bill I introduced in the 81st Congress and in subsequent Congresses. However, up to this time I have not been able to get the Post Office Department to make a favorable report on such a bill, because of the fear that the shipment of live scorpions through the mails might result in injury to postal employees.

Now that a satisfactory plastic bag has been devised, and the Post Office Department is convinced that live scorpions can be safely shipped through the mails, the Department has withdrawn its objection to the passage of such a bill.

The subject is of considerable importance. Senators are aware of the fact, of course, that serpent serum is used in the treatment of persons who have been bitten by serpents. In many cases the injection of such a serum saves the lives of persons who have been bitten.

Scorpion stings are also very serious and can prove fatal, particularly to children. Even adults have died from scorpion stings. The same antivenom practices which are used with respect to serpents can also be used with respect to scorpions.

One of the leaders in the development of this practice as applied to scorpions is Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke, the head of the poisonous animals research laboratory of Arizona State College. An article describing his work, entitled "Arizona's Venom Man," was published in the February 1953 issue of *Arizona Highways*, and I ask unanimous consent that an extract from the article be printed in the *Record* at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

Extensive scientific research with venoms in Arizona has revolved, for nearly a quarter of a century, around the dreams, hopes and labors of Dr. Herbert L. Stahnke, head of the department of biological sciences and director of the poisonous animals research laboratory at Arizona State College. Dr. Stahnke came west from Chicago in 1928 to make Arizona his home. He married shortly thereafter and by the time his first child was a few years old he had heard of a number of fatalities among children from scorpion sting. This caused him so much concern that he made an effort to find out all he could about scorpions and the best form of treatment that was available or recommended for victims of their sting. Information was scarce and even what he did read or hear was often contradicted by other sources of information. Most alarming of all, there seemed to be no sure treatment for the sting of the lethal species.

During the next few years, Dr. Stahnke collected specimens from all corners of the Southwest and through careful study and scientific observation and experimentation he became one of the best informed authorities on scorpions and other venomous animals of the Southwest. In recognition of his work he is listed in "Who's Who" and a host of other leading indexes covering noted persons. In his poisonous animals laboratory at Arizona State College he studied effects of various venoms on the bodily functions of laboratory rats. His findings in administering carefully measured nonlethal doses stirred his hopes and imagination to new and fascinating heights. Different venoms react in different ways.

Scorpion venom, for example, reacts as a particular type of nerve stimulant. In controlled doses the doctor feels that venom might hold out great therapeutic possibilities in the treatment of polio paralysis by gradually stimulating the dormant nerves and muscles, encouraging them to function again. The reaction of venom on cancer cells is being studied with laboratory rats and mice and as assistance in starting this effort the laboratory received a \$5,000 grant from the Damon Runyon Foundation.

The field of venom therapy is comparatively unexplored, and one with a seeming vast array of possibilities in the treatment of various human disorders. However, as is usually the case when new fields are being pioneered, there was the ever-present discouraging lack of sufficient funds needed to obtain the necessary costly equipment and assistance. There were no college funds available for such research so it was necessary to inch along painfully slowly on the proverbial shoestring. First things must come first and a serum to combat the effects of lethal scorpion sting was number one on Dr. Stahnke's list.

Putting every spare moment to the challenge and with much makeshift laboratory equipment, most of it laboriously handmade, he pushed his No. 1 dream forward to the final stage. The result was a serum that worked near-miracles in saving lives of children who had been stung by the sculptratus or gertschi and, because they had not received first aid in time, were in the last stages of convulsion preceding death. If becoming a world's leading authority on venomous animals was the first major milestone in his career, then practically wiping out the scorpion hazard of the Southwest was the second.

But then the problem was not completely whipped. All the years that went into study of venomous animals leading up to scorpion antitoxin were of little avail if the serum could not be produced in sufficient quantities to supply the entire area where it might sometime be needed. Distances in the Southwest are great and scorpion venom works fast. A child stung in Yuma would receive little relief from a vial of serum in Tempe, no matter how excellent the serum was. And then, lethal scorpions are the least common in the State and 10,000 live ones of this species would be required each year to provide serum for all the possible danger areas in Arizona. To obtain 10,000 scorpions was an insurmountable task without public cooperation. Then, even if the people of Arizona and neighboring States heard about this need, there was still no satisfactory means to send live scorpions to the laboratory. Though the mails were fast and efficient, postal regulations forbid using the mails for the transporting of live scorpions. Other methods of shipment proved either too costly or slow or the packages often were in the hot sun long enough so that as a general rule scorpions were in bad shape or dead upon arrival.

In an effort to overcome this major obstacle in conquering the scorpion, by obtaining sufficient quantities of them as a venom supply for serum manufacture, Dr. Stahnke has designed a simple lightweight cylindrical mailing tube container with a plastic inner bag which is completely airtight and escape-proof even if damaged or crushed. Since a scorpion could easily spend a week in such a sealed container and suffer no ill effects, it is the ideal answer for transportation to the laboratory from all parts of the State. In an effort to modify a postal regulation which all but blocks the serum program, Dr. Stahnke has the backing of many interested persons, including the Governor of Arizona and Arizona Senators in Washington, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Postmaster's Advisory Committee, the Postal Employees Union of Tucson, and many others. Senate bill 1886 has been introduced to "permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical-research purposes."

This bill is but awaiting approval of the Postmaster General, and with his understanding cooperation and endorsement will surely be acted upon, opening the way not only for adequate serum manufacture but for further advancement in the science of venom therapy.

Even after the required number of scorpions is collected, each one has to be "milked" of its venom and much elaborate and expensive specially designed laboratory equipment is required to manufacture the serum on a proper scale. The venom has to be frozen and then all moisture content removed. Then it must be weighed to the fraction of a milligram and rediluted with a known quantity of distilled water. In small non-lethal doses it is periodically injected into the blood stream of a laboratory animal until an immunity is built up. And then a small amount of blood is drawn from the immunized animal and through more intricate sterile processing the serum separated from the red corpuscles is again frozen, dehydrated, weighed, and bottled for distribution. The laboratory animals in this case are cats and few cats have a softer life. Not only do they enjoy temperature controlled sanitary quarters but their diet is balanced and ideal for their welfare. The gradual periodic venom doses cause them little or no discomfort, and the only contribution they are called on to make is an occasional blood donation, no more bothersome than giving a pint of blood to the Red Cross is for a human being.

In the spring of 1951 the Tucson Daily Citizen, hearing of the serum and the lack of funds to supply the State, got behind Dr. Stahnke and put on a campaign to acquaint the citizens of Arizona with the need for scorpions and funds through donations to put the serum program in process. At once a series of informative news items and editorials placed the problem before the public. Response was immediate and generous. Temporary scorpion centers were set up and, while donations rolled in to the Daily Citizen, quantities of scorpions arrived daily through these centers to the laboratory in Tempe. Though most of them were the more common non-lethal ground scorpions, which were useless in the manufacture of serum, they were valuable for the venom therapy program. And enough sculptratus arrived to start full scale operation.

On June 26, 1951, the Tucson Daily Citizen invited Dr. Stahnke to Tucson to receive a check for \$4,500 to apply on the procurement of equipment and start the serum manufacture ball rolling. Two days later the Arizona State Legislature passed a bill giving an appropriation of \$1,500 to finance a year's manufacture of serum. Dr. Stahnke, in appreciation of the splendid cooperation of this newspaper and the citizens of Arizona who contributed to the cause, took with him to Tucson the only two precious vials of serum he possessed and presented them to the Tucson Health Center.

Almost like a dramatic climax to a story, 3 days later little 4-year-old Rachel Baraza of Tucson got up from her nap and started to get dressed for a party. As she picked up her shoe a tiny straw-colored scorpion dropped out and stung her on the thumb. She was rushed to a hospital but in only a few minutes the child was experiencing the specific symptoms of a fatal dose of venom. Suddenly the doctor recalled having read in the paper of the serum presented to the Tucson Health Center a few days before by Dr. Stahnke. The police were notified and a motorcycle patrolman rushed the serum from the medical center to the hospital where it was administered to the patient. In a short time Rachel was relaxed and over the crisis.

Today in the refrigerator of Dr. Stahnke's laboratory, where only two tiny life-saving vials of antivenin once stood as guardians

of life provided they could get to the patient in time, there are trays and trays of fresh serum available to any doctor or hospital throughout the State where they are needed, free for the requesting. In this dehydrated state the serum is good for 5 years and all that Dr. Stahnke asks in return is that a simple medical report form be filled out explaining when and how the serum was used and the results. When this form arrives in the laboratory a new supply of serum is automatically shipped to the sender.

These little vials of life-saving serum placed throughout the State are each a proud monument to a scientist who, facing a common fear, rolled up his sleeves and conquered it for the benefit of his fellow men. This accomplishment he takes in stride and never misses a step in his ceaseless effort to search for important scientific and humanitarian benefits in his field and to spread knowledge and useful information on this subject through all media available to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the report of the committee on the pending bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 131) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Poisonous Animals Research Laboratory at the Arizona State College in Tempe has been making antivenin and doing extensive research work for a number of years with live scorpions as subjects.

The number of scorpions required yearly both for the production of serum and for use in research work cannot be obtained locally. It is not practical to raise them since a 5-year growth is required before they are large enough to milk and it has been determined that the cost of providing a natural habitat and live insects for food for such a long period of time would make the price of the serum prohibitive and their use for research out of the question.

Scorpion antivenin manufactured in other parts of the world is not of value in the Southern United States, since the reaction is species-specific. That is, an antivenin from a species living in one area of the world is not therapeutically effective against the lethal sting of a different species living in another geographic area.

Scorpions are found in most of the Southern States but are most plentiful in the Southwest and particularly Arizona. However, collecting a quantity of live specimens is difficult. It is not feasible to employ collectors and their transportation by express is costly and frequently impossible because express agents are not located in many of the smaller communities where scorpions are most abundant.

SAFETY FACTOR

A sturdy tube containing a plastic bag has been developed and suggested for use in transporting the scorpions through the mail. It is asserted that this would provide as great a protection, or greater, than is now afforded from some other dangerous materials now permitted in the mails.

STATE SURVEY

The Arizona State College conducted a survey of medical doctors as follows:

1. Number of questionnaires.....	485
2. Number returned.....	377
3. Number of doctors whose practice included scorpion sting cases....	237

4. Number of doctors desiring anti-scorpion serum.....	251
5. Number of scorpion sting cases treated in 10-month period.....	1,228
6. Number of therapeutic doses of serum requested.....	428

VIEWS OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Hearings were held by the committee on S. 1886, an identical bill introduced in the 81st Congress by Senator CARL HAYDEN. The bill was not reported at that time because of opposition voiced by the Post Office Department. Since the Department is now convinced that safe shipping containers have been developed and can be made available to shippers in remote areas in the State of Arizona, the Department has removed its objection as indicated in its letter of March 8, 1955, which follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1955.

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service, United States
Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for a report on S. 35, a bill to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

The purpose of this measure is to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to direct the Postmaster General to permit the transmission of live scorpions in the mails under such regulations as he may prescribe. The scorpions would be used for medical research.

This Department has made a careful study of this matter. Although scorpions are highly dangerous because of their poisonous sting, it has been concluded that packaging standards can be devised to minimize the possibility of postal employees being stung by the insects while they are in the mails.

In view of the worthy purpose for which it is proposed to permit the mailing of live scorpions, and the further fact that employee groups have indicated they favor enactment of this legislation, the Post Office Department will interpose no objections to the enactment of S. 35.

It is not believed that the enactment of this legislation will result in any additional cost to this Department.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1955.

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service, United States
Senate, 134 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 25, 1955, inviting the Bureau of the Budget to comment on S. 35, a bill to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions.

Live scorpions have been found valuable for use in medical research. For example, venom from scorpions is necessary for the manufacture of a serum used for the treatment of scorpion stings, which otherwise might prove fatal.

Enactment of this bill would permit the mailing of live scorpions by amending section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to direct the Postmaster General to permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions under such regulations as he may prescribe. The Post Office Department has advised that suitable packaging standards can be devised, which would minimize the possibility of danger to postal employees resulting from the insects while in the mails.

Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD PEARSON,
Assistant Director.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported, are shown as follows (existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman, new matter is printed in italics):

SECTION 1716, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE
§ 1716. Injurious articles as nonmailable.

All kinds of poison, and all articles and compositions containing poison, and all poisonous animals, insects, reptiles, and all explosives, inflammable materials, infernal machines, and mechanical, chemical, or other devices or compositions which may ignite or explode, and all disease germs or scabs, and all other natural or artificial articles, compositions, or material which may kill or injure another, or injure the mails or other property, whether or not sealed as first-class matter, are nonmailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or station thereof, nor by any letter carrier.

The Postmaster General may permit the transmission in the mails, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe as to preparation and packing, of any such articles which are not outwardly or of their own force dangerous or injurious to life, health, or property.

The Postmaster General shall permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions to be used for medical research work under such regulations as he may prescribe with respect to the packaging of such scorpions as will give adequate protection to postal personnel and make for ease of handling by the research worker.

The transmission in the mails of poisonous drugs and medicines may be limited by the Postmaster General to shipments of such articles from the manufacturer thereof or dealer therein to licensed physicians, surgeons, dentists, pharmacists, druggists, cosmetologists, barbers, and veterinarians, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.

The transmission in the mails of poisons for scientific use, and which are not outwardly dangerous or of their own force dangerous or injurious to life, health, or property, may be limited by the Postmaster General to shipments of such articles between the manufacturers thereof, dealers therein, bona fide research or experimental scientific laboratories, and such other persons who are employees of the Federal, a State, or local government, whose official duties are comprised, in whole or in part, of the use of such poisons, and who are designated by the head of the agency in which they are employed to receive or send such articles, under such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

All spirituous, vinous, malted, fermented, or other intoxicating liquors of any kind are nonmailable and shall not be deposited in or carried through the mails.

Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail, according to the direction thereon, or at any place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, anything declared nonmailable by this section, unless in accordance with the rules and regulations authorized to be prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly causes to be de-

livered by mail, according to the direction thereon or at any place to which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, anything declared nonmailable by this section, whether or not transmitted in accordance with the rules and regulations authorized to be prescribed by the Postmaster General, with intent to kill or injure another, or injure the mails or other property, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 781; May 8, 1952, ch. 246, 66 Stat. 67.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1716 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second paragraph thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"The Postmaster General shall permit the transmission in the mails of live scorpions to be used for medical research work under such regulations as he may prescribe with respect to the packaging of such scorpions as will give adequate protection to postal personnel and make for ease of handling by the research worker."

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 131, S. 500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on next Monday may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIXTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the designation of April 14 as Pan-American Day gives us an opportunity to pause a moment in our unrelenting endeavor to stave off war, to pay homage to an experiment in peace. The learned historian, Arthur Toynbee, has said that his-

tory will characterize our epoch, not for the immense technological strides that have been made, not as the atomic age, but rather as the period when man for the first time reached across boundaries of race, religion, and nationality to help his fellow men, for the good of all mankind. If Dr. Toynbee is right, then the organization whose development we commemorate today will occupy a place of honor in history. The growth of pan-Americanism, viewed in historical perspective, will surely be considered by posterity as one of the notable achievements of our era.

Pessimism, born of the failure of the League of Nations and nourished by the frustrations of the United Nations, has been corroding our faith in international organizations for maintaining peace. The Organization of American States stands alone, but firm, as proof of the effectiveness of international cooperation. It stands as a beacon light in the dark, inspiring optimism when doubts assail us. It is fitting that we pause each year to reexamine the evolution of that institution, and by so doing, to rekindle our hope that the noble principles motivating it will spread to other parts of the world.

The Organization of American States was not easily arrived at or built over night. A good many obstacles had to be surmounted; fears had to be assuaged, prejudices eradicated, and self-interests repressed before the 21 nations that make up the membership of the organization could work together in their collective interest. As far back as 1826 the great South American liberator, Bolivar, conceived of the idea of a union of the democracies of the Western Hemisphere. In those days the newly independent nations were menaced by the Holy Alliance; it was Bolivar's idea that by union, the young states could protect themselves against any threat. The rough draft prepared by Bolivar for the conference he called in Panama contains these prophetic words:

This congress seems destined to form the vastest league, the most extraordinary and the strongest which has ever appeared on earth. . . . No one of [the nations] will be weak in respect to any other; no one will be stronger. A perfect equilibrium would be established in this truly new order of things. The strength of all would come to the aid of any one which might suffer from the aggression of a foreign enemy.

The Panama Conference, as you know, was a dismal failure. Owing to factional opposition in the United States Congress, there was much delay in appointing the American delegates to the gathering. One of two that were finally appointed died on the way to Panama, and the other arrived too late. The politicians in Buenos Aires, jealous of the leading part played by Colombia, declined the invitation. Paraguay, then a principal state, also remained aloof. When the conference met, only Mexico, Central America, Colombia, and Peru had delegates present. Under the circumstances, Bolivar's magnificent dream of a union of the American nations in the interest of peace, protection, and general advancement, went up in smoke. But it

did establish a definite precedent for future inter-American meetings.

Later in the century other attempts were made to get joint action. One gathering in Peru in 1847, with delegates from New Granada, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Chile in attendance, was directed against the United States who was at war with Mexico. The avowed aim of the conference was confederation for the purpose of preserving independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty. No permanent results came from the meeting, or from other conferences of small groups of Latin American states held later in the century.

In the meantime, some of the South American nations themselves fell into battle with each other. In the 1860's the population of Paraguay was decimated in a war against an alliance consisting of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. In 1879, Chile went to war against Peru and Bolivia, and claimed the victor's spoils, which included Peru's nitrate-rich provinces of Tacna and Arica and Bolivia's seacoast. The Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia that began in 1932 killed about 60,000 Bolivians and a good many Paraguayans; continental animosities sharpened when Chile actively supported Bolivia and Argentina threw its aid to Paraguay.

In spite of the bitterness generated from these flare-ups, certain unifying forces were at work. The revolutionary struggles by the American states against Spain and England left in their wake powerful sentiments shared by all the people of the New World. They held themselves to be different from those in the Old World, a new race on a new continent. They believed that Europe was old, corrupt, torn by wars, governed by tyranny, pessimistic, and declining. On the other hand, they believed that America was the opposite, young and vigorous and destined to fulfill mankind's utopian dream.

From these basic convictions, a mass of related sentiments derived. It was held that democratic republican government is the best form of government, all others being inclined to tyranny; that states are equal, irrespective of size and power; that being equal, no state has a right to intervene in the affairs of another; that disputes between states could be settled peacefully by substituting the rule of law for that of force; that cooperation would replace competition. So deep-seated were these convictions, that they withstood the turbulent years of reorganization and intermittent warfare.

While sometimes lost in the clash of fraternal battle, Bolivar's vision of a family of American nations never completely died. In 1889, a first major step was taken to make the dream a reality. In that year, at an invitation from the United States to meet in Washington to discuss commercial matters, 18 of the then 19 American republics responded favorably. This was the first of the series of international conferences of American nations. The delegates to that first feeble effort at cooperation on a hemispheric basis did not realize the precedent they were establishing. One

contemporary United States newspaper, reflecting the prevailing opinion, even declared that "the Pan American Conference is pronounced a failure by those most concerned." Today, with the advantage of hindsight, we commemorate the 65th anniversary of that conference as the modest beginning of the mighty union we have today.

But not all was clear sailing for the inter-American ship after the first Pan American conference. In the first decades of the 20th century the United States pursued a course that was bitterly unpopular in Latin America. This policy consisted of unilateral intervention of United States Armed Forces in other American nations to protect United States lives and property or to prevent real or imagined threats of European intervention; the practice of dollar diplomacy, whereby the United States sought to control the finances of certain of the Caribbean countries; and the decision on the part of the United States to apply the Monroe Doctrine without consulting the other American States. Under the circumstances, it was unlikely that progress toward unity could be achieved.

All of us know the happy consequences that resulted when the United States signed the treaty at Montevideo in 1933 pledging nonintervention. With the shift to the good neighbor policy, the whole concept of pan-Americanism had a rebirth. After that, in rapid succession, the sister republics laid the foundations for hemispheric solidarity. When war clouds began to darken the horizon in Europe, the nations of America gathered at Buenos Aires and agreed upon a procedure for consultation in emergencies. Actual outbreak of World War II put the machinery of consultation into effect. During the war, the American nations worked in close cooperation. After the war the 21 republics formalized their system of mutual defense and peaceful settlement of disputes by the Rio and Bogota pacts. Today the Organization of American States is a far cry from the timid excursion into inter-American cooperation of 65 years ago. It comes very close to realizing Bolivar's dream of the New World united in defense of the noble principles of freedom and independence.

But today the threat to our institutions comes not only from physical attack, as Bolivar feared from the hands of the Holy Alliance. Instead, every country in the Western Hemisphere is under constant, insidious assault. The current enemy, international communism, has created a new dimension in international warfare. Communism attacks at the very moral fibers of a nation. It has developed a modern Trojan horse technique of boring from within, of first spreading dissatisfaction and fear and suspicion, and then presenting itself as the savior. In Latin America, this precise moment in history is auspicious for the Communist scheme. The people have awakened from their apathy and resignation. They are seething with discontent for their lot, and no longer accept gnawing hunger and disease as their portion. The Communist defection of Guatemala, however-short-lived,

should serve as a warning that it can happen here. The removal through revolution of Communists from influential posts in Guatemala has done nothing to relieve the conditions that fostered the rise of those Communists in the first place.

All the mutual defense pacts and pledges of solidarity will not halt the war of ideas the Communists are waging. I do not mean by this statement to belittle the effectiveness of the inter-American system. Its continuous and upward growth in the face of difficulties, culminating in the fine Organization of American States which exists today is an island in the turbulent sea of international relations. I do mean, however, that we must not stop working to make it even more effective. We must not be so satisfied with our handiwork to date that we will permit our thinking with regard to Latin America to ossify. We must keep it fluid so that we are prepared to meet every new challenge in this dynamic and changing world.

Since it is presently unlikely that the Soviet Union will launch physical warfare upon one or more of our sister republics, we must be prepared to combat a different type of assault. The Latin American delegates to the conference in Rio last November pointed the way. They need help to raise the living standards of their people quickly, before they turn in desperation to the false promises held out to them by the Communists. Our full-hearted cooperation with Latin America in the economic field is as essential to the preservation of American institutions as is our military and political cooperation. If we are to meet the threat posed by Communist infiltration, we must take bold, original measures. Fortunately, the inter-American system has not been rigid. It has proved again and again that it can, so to speak, roll with the punches.

It is my fervent hope and prayer on this 65th anniversary of the Pan American movement that the unity of purpose of the sister republics of the Western Hemisphere will be increased and strengthened, and that the nations of the New World, through sincere efforts at cooperation, will march steadily toward the fulfillment of Bolivar's vision of a prosperous and free continent, at peace with the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who believes in Pan American understanding and unity, I appreciate what the Senator from Florida has said about the history of the Pan American movement, and I wish to associate myself with him in his remarks.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the supplemental appropriation bill, which he has just joined in passing, there is an additional contribution to the Pan-American Institute of Geography and History, in furtherance of an act passed by Congress last year. I hope it will have some additional value by virtue of having been passed on the

65th anniversary of the Pan American Union.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate very much the Senator's remarks. I feel certain that the people of Massachusetts value highly the Senator's interest in conditions around the world as well as in the affairs of his own people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as has already been noted, today is the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and because of my interest in the subject as a member of the Subcommittee on American Republics, I wish to pay tribute to the great success which has attended the Organization of American States.

This organization was established in 1889, the first Pan American Conference having been held in Washington. From that early beginning the organization has developed into one of the most remarkable international structures the world has seen.

The Pan American Union and the Association of American States are a great tribute to the good will and consistency of purpose of the republics of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres in this part of the world; and to their ability to get together on their mutual problems, and increasingly to strengthen the effectiveness of the Organization of American States.

Pan-American Day as such was first proclaimed 25 years ago in commemoration of this organization and its activities before that time. As I mentioned a moment ago, it is a system of voluntary associations of independent republics, which has been a stimulus and in some ways has been a pattern, for other organizations in other parts of the world.

We have recently seen several examples of its success—the Guatemalan situation; the recent tension between Costa Rica and Nicaragua; the solution of problems in other nations in South America; border disputes and the commissions which have been voluntarily set up to solve those disputes peacefully and without resort to the force which before that time had been all too often used.

And so, Mr. President, I merely want to pay tribute today to the vigor and the unity with which the American republics have successfully solved, in the main, the problems which occur in this hemisphere, and the problems which constantly beset the nations so far as their associations with one another are concerned. I hail this day as an anniversary, and I am sure we can look forward in the future to increasing strength and increasing success of this great American institution.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate

adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and associate editor of World Affairs, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of light and of love, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the United States Congress.

Grant us, we beseech thee, the divine graces necessary for our salvation.

Enlighten our souls with generous principles of goodness, freedom, and progress.

Strengthen our wills that we may embrace the sacrifices required to make good neighborliness a golden reality rather than a form of words.

Guide us, dear Saviour, in the ways of righteousness, truth, fairness, and sincere affection for all the people of the American Republics and Canada.

These are the favors we seek in the name of our Redeemer, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed joint resolutions and bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 21, 1955:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

On March 25, 1955:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; and

H. R. 2576. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1957.

On March 30, 1955:

H. R. 4259. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

On March 31, 1955:

H. R. 4720. An act to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; and

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

On April 5, 1955:

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

On April 11, 1955:

H. R. 4436. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the revised statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay";

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1139. An act to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts;

S. 1600. An act to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE DAN A. SUTHERLAND

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death of a man who served 10 years in these halls. My predecessor, Dan A. Sutherland, died March 23 at Abbington Memorial Hospital, Pennsylvania, at the age of 85 years. He served as Delegate in Congress from the Territory of Alaska

from the 67th through the 71st Congress, covering the years from 1921 to 1931. He was not a candidate for election to the 72d Congress. After leaving office in the spring of 1931 he and Mrs. Sutherland moved to Pennsylvania where the former Delegate became associated with a sister in the operation of the Ogontz School, at or near Rydal. Although he never again lived in the Territory, Mr. Sutherland visited there occasionally and maintained an interest in Alaska affairs.

Born at Pleasant Bay on Cape Breton Island, Canada, April 17, 1869, Mr. Sutherland moved with his parents to Essex, Mass., in 1876. There he attended the public schools and later was employed as a grocer's clerk. From Massachusetts he made the long trip to Circle City, Alaska, in 1898 and in 1900 went on to Nome, later living at Juneau and in the Fourth Judicial Division of Alaska. He mined in many sections of the country and also engaged in fishing. A Republican, Mr. Sutherland was appointed as United States marshal for the First Division of Alaska in 1908, serving in that capacity for 2 years. In 1910 he was married to Hilda Evanson at Nulato, Alaska, and was a resident of Ruby, also on the Yukon River, when he was elected as a member of the first Alaska Territorial Senate in 1912. Reelected, he also served as a member of the Territorial Board of Education under appointment from Gov. Thomas Riggs. He was Alaska's fourth Delegate. Frank Waskey had been elected as Alaska's first Delegate in Congress for the short term at the election of 1906; at the same election, Thomas Cale was elected to the long term. James Wickersham served as Delegate following the election of 1908 until Dan Sutherland was chosen to succeed him in the election of 1920 after Judge Wickersham had left office of his own volition.

Mr. Sutherland is survived by his widow and a son who is a member of a university faculty in Colorado.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on May 11, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days we have heard quite a bit of talk about the State Department and the Secretary of State relative to his attitude generally on various subjects.

Yesterday I inserted in the RECORD two letters from a very distinguished citizen and constituent of mine, Mr. Marcus A. Gallagher, of Lawrenceburg, Tenn. In

his letters to the Secretary of State, Mr. Gallagher outlined a very serious condition that was resulting from the maltreatment of religious groups in Italy.

On March 4 he wrote the Secretary of State the first letter. The Secretary of State has not even extended the courtesy of making a routine reply to this constituent of mine.

On April 4 he directed another letter to the Secretary of State outlining the same situation, yet has received no reply.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that is the general attitude of the Department of State, not even acknowledging letters relating to situations involving religion, or is it just an attitude generally of our Secretary of State?

I certainly feel that this outstanding Republican constituent of mine should have a reply from the Secretary of State on this very vital subject which has disturbed Christian men and women throughout the world.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 65th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. All the peoples of the Americas have every reason today to express their gratitude that so great a group of nations as these 21 American Republics of ours—covering a vast area and including millions of human beings—have found a way of working together to achieve common purposes and a just and lasting peace.

The United States has the proud distinction of being first of the American Republics to become independent, and we can be proud of the fact that our sister Republics of this hemisphere, as they acquired their own independence, patterned their national constitutions on our own Constitution.

It is refreshing on Pan-American Day to recall the many interchanges with our sister Republics which uphold and develop further understanding and friendship through the official agencies of government. The progress so far made by the American Republics in seeking ways to establish their independence and liberty upon solid foundations is a bright chapter in world history. While there have been some few mistakes and some possible misunderstandings during this march toward achievement of perpetual security and peace, such mistakes and misunderstandings have been rectified by conferences in which the equality of each republic was taken into proper consideration. With a firm resolve and a spirit of unity, the Western Hemisphere Republics look forward to perfecting an understanding and trust upon which our country and our neighbors shall always meet.

I am glad to have the privilege of joining my colleagues in paying tribute to those who work with us to promote hemisphere solidarity, in the spirit of good will to help produce the true foundations for world peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that indefinite leave of absence be granted to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] on account of illness.

THE LATE WILLIAM SEBASTIAN JACOBSEN

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad assignment for me to report to the House of Representatives that a former Member—William Sebastian Jacobsen—passed away suddenly late Sunday afternoon. Interment occurred yesterday morning in Clinton, Iowa, where he was born on January 15, 1887. His mother preceded him in death by only 10 days.

Bill Jacobsen, as he was familiarly called, served during the 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses as Representative of the old Second District of Iowa, and succeeded his father, the late Bernard M. Jacobsen, who represented the same district for three terms preceding his son's election. It was a father-son succession.

In 1941, the General Assembly of Iowa resolved that the State should be reapportioned, and as a result of that decision, Representative Jacobsen and I found ourselves seeking the same office in the campaign of 1942. It was a vigorous but friendly contest conducted on a high plane by two contestants who had served together in this Chamber for 4 years and who regarded one another with respect and esteem.

Representative Jacobsen will be remembered for diligent service on the then Naval Affairs Committee. He will also be remembered as a loyal and staunch member of his party. He will be remembered, too, as a successful businessman in several fields—merchandising, real estate, finance, and radio ownership and operation. His energy was directed also to civic affairs in which he took genuine interest.

It is not too much to say that Bill Jacobsen will be remembered by his friends for his warm personality and generous spirit. Deepfelt sympathy is extended to his widow, his 2 sons, his 3 sisters, and other surviving relatives.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and regret that I read in the paper of the passing of our dearly beloved former colleague and friend, Bill Jacobsen. Bill was a

hail fellow well met. To know him was to love him. When I first came to Congress, he, as a member of the opposite party, greeted me warmly and extended the hand of fellowship. He was always ready to assist me when I needed help. I will always remember him for his kindness toward me in those days. Bill Jacobsen loved people; he loved his native State. He never ceased to work for the good of all the people, whether in Congress or out. His passing is a great loss to the State of Iowa and to the Nation. My sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. TALLE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the relatives of my very dear friend, the late William Jacobsen. His mother passed away only 10 days before the death of our former colleague. Together, he and his father represented the old second district of Iowa for 12 years. When I came to Congress in 1939, I was not acquainted with Bill Jacobsen, but we had scores of mutual friends, and he was awaiting me with open arms when I arrived in Washington. We became very close personal friends. He was strong in the essentials of good citizenship. Bill Jacobsen always viewed every important issue from one point of view: Is it good for our country? That was his attitude throughout his service. He represented the old area that sent to Congress the late Senator William B. Allison, who served a total of nearly 40 years in both the House and the Senate. He represented the old area that sent to Congress the late Speaker David B. Henderson, the only Speaker from Iowa, and the first Speaker of that great region west of the Mississippi River. Our friend, whom the older Members of the House will recall with a great deal of affection, served his country well on every occasion, and my heart goes out to his relatives, and particularly his charming wife, who many Members of Congress probably know. She served in the office of Senator Gillette for a good many years, and later served as secretary for our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry to hear of the death of Bill Jacobsen, who served in this House in an honorable and trustworthy manner and with great distinction to his people, his State, and country. His widow and sons may derive great consolation in the knowledge that he gave to his country the best of his capacity, which was outstanding. I know that the knowledge of his fine service in this body will always be a source of consolation to them and to his sons in particular a source of inspiration in their journey through life.

I extend to Mrs. Jacobsen, to the sons, and to the sisters of our late colleague, my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and accomplishments of our late colleague William Jacobsen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I knew Mr. Jacobsen well and had great respect for him. He was a fine patriot. He was a splendid public servant.

My sympathy goes out to all his loved ones.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to observe the passage of another year of cooperation among the republics of the Western Hemisphere. This Pan-American Day marks the 65th anniversary of the unique union of free nations now officially called the Organization of American States.

In a turbulent world filled with misapprehensions and mistrusts, the success of the 21 member states in their cooperative endeavor is a buoyant note, filling our hearts with optimism in the future of similar undertakings. To those who doubt the possibilities of maintaining international peace through cooperation, we point proudly to the Organization of American States.

Its creation was a remarkable achievement. The countries of the New World speak Spanish, Portuguese, French, English, and a pot-pourri of Indian languages; they are populated with many races and peoples of varied culture and background; they have had bitter memories of intermittent warfare to overcome. Yet, instead of dwelling upon their differences, the young republics determined to uphold jointly those ideals of freedom and the dignity of the individual that all hold dear. Out of the patient efforts of far-sighted American statesmen, both north and south of the Rio Grande, has grown the inter-American system we honor today. It touches every aspect of international life: Peaceful settlement of disputes within the Hemisphere, moral and military union against aggression from outside, cultural and economic cooperation for the advancement and strengthening of all members. It is my ardent hope that the inter-American system will become even stronger, and will continue to set a pattern that all the nations of the world might follow.

I am so pleased that on this meeting of the House of Representatives that my valued friend, Father Thorning, again offered prayer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks on Pan-American Day at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today, April 14, 1955, marks the 65th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, now the Secretariat of the Organization of American States. This day is traditionally observed by the 21 American Republics as Pan American Day.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it affords me great pleasure to convey my best wishes and deep feeling of friendship for our 20 sister Republics in Latin America. In March of this year, it was my privilege to have been selected by President Eisenhower to attend the inauguration of President Luis Batlle Berres as President of Uruguay. The trip to Uruguay afforded me an opportunity to visit other countries in Latin America and to renew the profound impressions which I had gained from earlier visits of the real feeling of friendship which exists in Latin America for the United States.

Pan American Day is not merely one day set aside for recognition of the ties which bind the Republics of the hemisphere but also serves as a symbol of the day-to-day relations between the United States and Latin America which are continuously cementing the good will which exists between us. Pan American Day also serves as a fitting reminder that in the Organization of American States we have an international agency that has done much to bring our countries closer together. Only recently we have seen how, through statesmanlike action, the Organization was able to avert a serious dispute which arose between two Central American Republics. The Organization does much in the field of economic and social progress and has been a strong force in building the solidarity of the hemisphere.

Each year on Pan-American Day we should be reminded that we must continue to work together for the welfare and security of the hemisphere and that these objectives require patience, understanding, cooperation, and a recognition of the mutual interests of our peoples.

CONSOLIDATION OF FUNDS UNDER VARIOUS ACTS FOR AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS AT LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a bill which will be of considerable help to all of the agricultural experiment stations in connection with the land-grant colleges of the United States.

This bill is introduced at the request of the directors of these agricultural experiment stations and at the request of

the United States Department of Agriculture.

Prior to becoming a Member of the House of Representatives, it was my pleasure to serve as president of the Utah State Agricultural College. In that capacity I controlled the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station and also worked closely with the experiment stations of other States. All of these State experiment stations are under a very cumbersome accounting system which is the result of adding various funds and amendments to the original Hatch Act of 1887. They must account separately for the funds of the Hatch act of 1887, the Adams Act of 1906, the Purnell Act of 1905, and Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 and amendments of 1946. My bill purposes to consolidate these funds into one fund for accounting purposes. It not only has the backing of the Department of Agriculture, but the Bureau of the Budget and the directors of the experiment stations of the United States, which directors have worked for 4 years to bring about this legislation.

The 83d Congress passed a bill which consolidated the funds of the Extension Service. This bill streamlined the Extension Service in exactly the same way in which my bill would streamline the work of the agricultural experiment stations. The Extension Service has been greatly benefited by the simplification and consolidation of funds brought about by the act of the 83d Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF J. SINCLAIR ARMSTRONG AS CHAIRMAN OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower announced yesterday that he had picked J. Sinclair Armstrong, a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to be the new Chairman to succeed Ralph H. Demmler, who is leaving the Commission.

Sinclair Armstrong is one of the younger, new generation of Americans that has brought the highest type of public service to Washington. He has had a distinguished career as a lawyer and civic leader in Chicago. He was for a number of years a member of the law firm of Isham, Lincoln & Beale, one of the great law firms of America.

The industry which he has displayed since becoming a member of the Commission is noteworthy. He has an enthusiasm about him which is contagious. He loves hard work and fortunately is endowed with much natural ability.

I doubt that the President could have, within the breadth of America, found a more capable, honest, and diligent public servant to head an administrative Commission. Irrespective of party, he is the kind of public servant who would

be generally approved under any administration.

Mr. Armstrong, in addition to all that I have thus far related, is the father of five fine children and enjoys the kind of family life which the people like to associate with American life. I am sure all of the House will be glad to hear of this splendid appointment by President Eisenhower.

ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a news story from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald in which it is stated that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROVHILL], making an address on yesterday commemorating the anniversary of the birth of the founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, referred to another great Democratic leader, Gen. Andrew Jackson, as an inept politician.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what other references were made to General Jackson, derogatory or otherwise, because I was not there to listen to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia make the address commemorating the birth of the founder of the Democratic Party.

While I am quite certain that such a mild epithet has not disturbed the memory of one of America's greatest leaders, I would suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that it is indeed fortunate that he represents a northern Virginia constituency rather than one in my own State of Louisiana. There the General's politics never disturbed us too much. As a matter of fact, we approved him about a thousand percent.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. As a Tennessean, I simply want to say that the name of Andrew Jackson occupies such an exalted position in the history of this country and he is held in such high esteem and genuine affection by the American people that no such derogatory remarks could make any impression on the people of this country.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would also like to say that we in Louisiana not only think of Andrew Jackson as a great Democrat but we remember his gallant and unbelievable defense of our city, his rout of the enemy, and his supreme qualities of leadership.

It could even be, I might suggest to the gentleman from the 10th Virginia district, that a few Louisianans who have migrated—and I might add some Tennesseans, or even just plain old Democrats who now reside in that district—might not necessarily appreciate derogatory references with respect to Gen. Andrew Jackson.

SALUTE TO DR. JONAS SALK

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday we saw the passage of a historic milestone in man's struggle against the mysterious forces of disease. The announcement in Ann Arbor, Mich., of the effectiveness of the poliomyelitis vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk is a truly remarkable and significant discovery which will undoubtedly rank high among the medical achievements of all time.

Grateful parents of children long threatened by the deadly crippling polio raise their voices in praise of the distinguished Pittsburgh doctor who has rendered such an outstanding and humane service to his fellow citizens and all mankind.

His name will be long remembered by our generation of healthy, polio-protected children and by generations yet unborn. Americans everywhere, as well as people throughout the world, salute Dr. Jonas Salk for his notable achievement and offer their personal thanks for a job well done.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include Senate Joint Memorial 7, passed by the Idaho State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Memorial 8, which was passed by the recent session of the Idaho State Legislature, petitions Congress to maintain at least one veterans' hospital in every State. I am sure I do not need to impress upon this body either the fairness nor the urgency of such a request.

The memorial was undoubtedly sparked by the recommendation of the Hoover Commission Task Force that a number of veterans' hospitals be closed, including the VA hospital in Boise—the only one in Idaho. Such a move would work an obvious and undeserved hardship on Idaho veterans.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that any move to close veterans' hospitals will meet with stubborn resistance in this body—especially in view of the waiting list of 3,200 GI psychiatric cases, and of the expanding need for more—not fewer hospitals as World War II veterans grow older and as medical research makes it manifest that more and more diseases stem from service injuries and experiences.

The memorial follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 8

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in this its

33d session, do respectfully petition and represent, that—

Whereas the welfare and rehabilitation of sick and disabled veterans of all wars of the United States, is of the utmost importance to the people of the several States; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has assumed the responsibility of providing hospitalization for all veterans with service-connected disability or disease or chronic illnesses; and

Whereas the national welfare will be promoted by maintaining a minimum of one veteran's hospital in every State of the Union, in recognition of the contribution of each State in the national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of Idaho of 1955, now in session (the senate and house of representatives, concurring), That we most earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to support and maintain not less than one veteran's hospital in each and every State of the United States, in order to more effectively carry out the Government's established policy toward veterans; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Director of the Veterans' Administration, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 1st day of March 1955.

J. BERKELEY LARSEN.

President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 4th day of March 1955.

R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], and my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], I read with amused interest the alleged remarks, which I assume were correctly quoted, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROXHILL]. Of course, nothing that anyone could say could dim the stature and position of Andrew Jackson in the minds of the American people. As part of the great history of our country, the battle of New Orleans alone is enough to refresh the memory of anyone who might perhaps forget Andrew Jackson. The only one whose position is dimmed is he who undertakes to attack Andrew Jackson. But in that same address, as I remember, the gentleman from Virginia said that Thomas Jefferson was the patron saint of the Republican Party. I assume he meant political patron saint. You know, unconsciously, the gentleman never made a more correct statement because Abraham Lincoln was a great Progressive. When you study the life of Abraham Lincoln, you find that Lin-

coln was a follower of Thomas Jefferson and the great political truths enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROXHILL], his guilty conscience probably operating, made that statement having in mind that if Lincoln were alive today, Lincoln would be a Democrat.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 140)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States continuously seeks to strengthen the spiritual, political, military, and economic bonds of the free nations. By cementing these ties, we help preserve our way of life, improve the living standards of free peoples, and make possible the higher levels of production required for the security of the free world. With this objective in view, I recommended to the Congress in my message of January 10, 1955, the enactment of legislation designed to promote a healthy trade expansion and an increased flow of private capital for economic development abroad.

Consistent with that broad purpose, the United States over the past 7 years has participated in the multilateral trade agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This key element in the Nation's foreign economic policy has been carried on under the authority vested in the President by the Congress in the trade agreements legislation. After several months of intensive review of the trade rules in the general agreement, the United States and 33 other participating countries last month agreed upon certain revisions of those rules. A new instrument was also drafted which would set up a simple international organization, to be known as the Organization for Trade Cooperation, whose purpose is the administration of the general agreement.

I should like to recall the circumstances that gave rise to the general agreement and this country's participation in it. I should also like to stress some of its benefits to us which justify the continued existence of the general agreement and United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The economic and political dislocations produced by World War II jeopardized, in the postwar years, the reestablishment of healthy, expanding international trade. Many countries had little to export and lacked the means to buy the products of other countries. Widespread resort to restrictions on imports and to discriminatory bilateral trade arrangements threatened a return to economic isolationism and narrow channels of Government-directed trade. There was a great need for cooperative efforts to reduce unjustifiable trade restrictions and to establish a set of principles, mu-

tually beneficial to the free nations of the world, for the reconstruction of world trade.

In this state of world affairs, the United States and a group of friendly nations negotiated a series of tariff agreements among themselves. They also negotiated a set of trade principles or rules to protect the tariff concessions. These tariff agreements and trade rules were incorporated in a multilateral trade agreement, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The trade rules consist basically of provisions which this Nation, since 1934, has incorporated in bilateral trade agreements to protect our interest in the tariff concessions granted to us in such agreements. They provide, for example, that tariff concessions should not be nullified by the imposition of other restrictions; that quantitative restrictions should not be imposed on imports; that trade restrictions, when used, should be nondiscriminatory as between countries; and that concessions granted to one country should be extended to like products of other countries in accordance with the unconditional most-favored-nation principle.

To provide the degree of flexibility required to meet the varying needs of participating countries, the general agreement provides for specific exceptions to the basic rules. Under certain circumstances waivers may be granted to countries to depart from these basic rules. The United States has obtained such a waiver to restrict imports of agricultural products on which we have Government programs.

The general agreement through the trade rules and the tariff negotiations sponsored under it has served well the purpose for which it was designed: the orderly expansion of international trade. Thirty-four countries, whose trade accounts for nearly four-fifths of the world's total trade, are now participating in this cooperative effort. World trade has expanded at a rapid rate, and for many countries foreign trade now represents a higher ratio to total output of goods than in the prewar years.

An important benefit to this country results from participation in multilateral trade negotiations under the general agreement. Doing so makes it possible for us to obtain more tariff concessions on our exports than would be forthcoming from bilateral negotiation. This country, as a party to the multilateral agreement, obtains benefits from concessions which other countries would be unwilling to negotiate except in a multilateral undertaking.

Some measure of the value of these multilateral trade agreement negotiations to the United States is indicated by the fact that we have been able to obtain concessions covering about 50 percent in value of our exports.

Another advantage to this country through our participation in the general agreement has been manifest during the past 2 years. Restrictions on the part of other countries against dollar imports are permitted under the trade rules for genuine balance of payments reasons, and as the balance of payments position of other countries has improved we have

been able to persuade them to relax such restrictions. Between 1953 and the beginning of 1955, 10 Western European countries had removed quantitative restrictions on dollar imports amounting to about 60 percent of such imports. Since the beginning of this year additional restrictions have been removed. In the absence of the general agreement it would be more difficult to persuade these countries to relax such controls. We are thus moving toward full realization of the tariff concessions that have been granted our exports since 1948. It is the policy of this Government to utilize the consultative procedures of the general agreement to press for the discharge of these commitments for the benefit of our foreign trade.

In addition to the general relaxation of restrictions on dollar imports that has been accomplished, we have been successful in persuading other countries to remove discriminatory restrictions against imports of particular dollar goods. This Government has protested the inconsistency between the discriminatory action in those cases and the principles of the general agreement. Certain discriminatory restrictions have thus been removed on imports from this country of such items as coal, apples, cigarettes, lumber, potatoes, textiles, automobiles, tobacco, petroleum, wool, and motion pictures.

A further important contribution of the general agreement to the extension of trade is the assurance against wholesale increases in tariff rates in export markets. Our exporters, therefore, can proceed with their plans for sales in markets abroad with a greater degree of certainty as to tariff rates. Participating countries may, of course, consistently with the trade rules, raise tariff rates in individual cases where serious injury to domestic industry is threatened.

The revised general agreement has been thoroughly reviewed within the executive branch of the Government. I believe it has been improved and strengthened. It protects the legitimate interests of this country and provides a firm basis for orderly trade expansion among the free nations of the world. The necessity for the United States to restrict imports of agricultural products with regard to which we have government programs is fully recognized. The right of this country to protect the legitimate interests of its industries and labor is clearly provided for. The rules of trade regarding the imposition of discriminatory import controls have been tightened and should assist in the efforts to remove and to prevent discriminatory restrictions against United States exports. The spirit with which the participating countries cooperated in the task of review and revision of the general agreement was heartening and augurs well for its future vitality.

The United States and the other participating countries concluded on the basis of seven years' experience that the organizational provisions of the general agreement should be changed to provide a continuous mechanism for the administration of the trade rules and the discussion of mutual trade problems. Under present arrangements these activ-

ities are confined largely to the annual sessions of the parties to the agreement. The participating countries therefore have proposed to set up an Organization for Trade Cooperation for more effective administration of the trade rules and related activities.

The Organization for Trade Cooperation would be established by a separate agreement among the participating countries. In addition to administering the general agreement, it would provide a mechanism through which arrangements for trade negotiations could be facilitated. It would also serve as a forum for the discussion of trade matters and for the amicable adjustment of problems involving the trade rules. The organization would have no supranational powers. It would conduct no trade negotiations; this would be done by the countries who choose to participate in the negotiations and to whatever extent they choose.

The United States delegation which took part in the revision of the general agreement was specifically instructed to reject all efforts to expand the functions of the new organization into fields other than trade. One measure of the success of the negotiations from the standpoint of the United States is the fact that the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation is thus limited in its functions. Its effectiveness, in my judgment, will be enhanced by the fact that it has such specific and limited responsibilities.

I believe the reasons for United States membership in the proposed organization are overwhelming. We would thus demonstrate to the free world our active interest in the promotion of trade among the free nations. We would demonstrate our desire to deal with matters of trade in the same cooperative way we do with military matters in such regional pacts as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and with financial matters in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We would thus cooperate further with the free world, in the struggle against Communist domination, to the greater security and the greater prosperity of all.

Such action would serve the enlightened self-interest of the United States. As a member of this Organization we could work more effectively for the removal of discriminatory restrictions against our exports. We could help establish conditions favorable to convertibility of currencies. We could further the expansion of markets abroad for the products of our mines, our farms, and our factories. We could assist in the development of conditions conducive to the international flow of investment capital so urgently needed to expand production throughout the free world, especially in its underdeveloped areas.

Failure to assume membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would be interpreted throughout the free world as a lack of genuine interest on the part of this country in the efforts to expand trade. It would constitute a serious setback to the momentum which has been generated toward that objective. It would strike a severe blow at

the development of cooperative arrangements in defense of the free world. It could lead to the imposition of new trade restrictions on the part of other countries, which would result in a contraction of world trade and constitute a sharp setback to United States exports. It could result in regional realignments of nations. Such developments, needless to say, would play directly into the hands of the Communists.

I believe the national interest requires that we join with other countries of the free world in dealing with our trade problems on a cooperative basis.

I herewith transmit copies of the agreement providing for an Organization for Trade Cooperation, and I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing United States membership in that Organization.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 14, 1955.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5502, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is entitled to recognition for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is entitled to recognition for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. I would like at this time to ascertain the program for next week, if the gentleman from Massachusetts can tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to state the program for next week at this time. I have it quite generally made up, but there are one or two matters that I wanted to look into

further. I am sure the gentleman wants me to state the agreement we have with reference to today.

If at the conclusion of the bill there are any rollcalls, the rollcalls will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. That is the agreement, as I understand it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if the bill is passed without any rollcalls, that is entirely different. If it is passed, then I shall ask unanimous consent to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations brings you for your consideration today after having held hearings in regard thereto since the second of February, the bill H. R. 5502, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

At the outset I should like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee. They labored long hours to bring forth this bill which is before the House today. I know of no finer group that could be assembled to handle this vitally important bill. They are all men of experience in this House. I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND]. I should also like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation for his fine work, his capable and honest diligence, to the executive secretary of this subcommittee, Mr. Jay B. Howe. Without his help we might not have produced such a good bill as we have here today.

I also want it understood at this time that this bill represents the thinking of every member of this subcommittee, from both sides of the aisle. Some of us on the subcommittee with regard to some of the items, thought they should have been higher; some of us thought they should be lower, but this bill represents an agreement patiently arrived at between all members of the subcommittee with regard to every item contained therein.

With regard to the Department of State there was requested the amount of \$147,267,197, which would represent a substantial increase over the amount of the current year's appropriation, to wit: \$129,585,000. In its judgment the committee cut the President's budget estimate to the extent of \$20,497,220, allowing the amount contained in the bill, to wit: \$126,769,977.

With regard to the Department of Justice the committee was requested to appropriate the sum of \$201,485,000. The committee allowed \$197,525,000. It should be remembered that included in this item for the Department of Justice are the appropriations for the coming fiscal year not only for the maintenance of the law office of the Government, the Office of the Attorney General, and the

district attorneys throughout the country, but also the appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal prison system, and the Office of Alien Property.

In connection with the \$30,279,715 request of the judicial branch of the Government, there was allowed the amount of \$29,603,250, a cut merely to the extent of \$676,465.

The next item is that for the United States Information Agency, which includes the Voice of America, wherein there was requested the amount of \$88,500,000. As the result of the understanding arrived at among all the members of the subcommittee this item was agreed upon in the amount of \$80,500,000, a cut of \$8 million in the amount of the Bureau of the Budget's request.

With regard to the request for funds appropriated to the President for the Refugee Relief item in the bill wherein the amount of \$16 million was requested, although the committee felt that the results of this program have been practically negligible and very disappointing, they also felt that to deny this money at this time might place the Congress in the position of being subsequently held responsible in the event of the failure of the administration of this program to carry it out as was originally planned by the Congress of the United States.

We have read in this morning's newspapers about suggested investigations to be made by the Congress with regard to this particular refugee relief bungling.

If you will take the time to read the printed transcript of the hearings had before this subcommittee, some very amazing things will be found in reference to the inept administration of this program. You will find at page 529 that as of last January 14 only 500 refugees had been brought to the United States.

As to the item, "Salaries and expenses, Department of State," I should point out that we have allowed \$1,860,000 over the comparable appropriation for the current fiscal year; but that the item for salaries and expenses of the Department of State is \$5,790,000 below the amount of the budget estimate. Of the new money allowed, \$1,500,000 is for the personnel improvement program set up following the Wriston report; \$100,000 is staff strengthening, and \$260,000 for new foreign posts which are required to be opened.

The committee has denied the amount of \$1,600,000 requested for additional economic reporting and trade commissioners. The Department asked for \$1 million for 159 new employees in connection with expanded economic reporting and \$600,000 for 63 additional employees in connection with the trade commissioner program. As pointed out in the report, we already have in the budget for the State Department \$6 million for reporting, of which \$2,200,000 is now being used for personal services of commercial attachés.

With regard to the request of the Department of State for a 47-percent increase in the next item which we shall continue to insist be labeled representation allowances rather than operations allowances, the committee has decided

to maintain this appropriation at the current level, to wit, \$475,000. We have denied the additional \$225,000 requested, and I am sure this will satisfy some gentlemen at one of whom I now look.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think the \$475,000, nearly a half million dollars, is a lot of money for the purpose for which it is being used?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that these allowances might be termed necessary evils. I have never had the great privilege of sitting down with the gentleman from Iowa in this regard, but may I say that some business can be successfully transacted only under certain circumstances. I am sure the gentleman would not want our lower-paid capable career employees in the Foreign Service to have to take their counterparts in the country at which they are stationed to dinner or lunch and then have to pay the bills out of their own pockets on the meager salaries they get.

Mr. GROSS. Throughout this bill there is provision made that counterpart funds or credits owed to or by the United States be used, is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, that is true. The credits the gentleman has mentioned have been attained as the result of the disposition of surplus property overseas and lend-lease transactions.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask this further question?

Mr. ROONEY. I am waiting for the first question. I am trying to ascertain what the gentleman is getting at.

Mr. GROSS. As far as foreign liquor is concerned, why not buy it out of these counterpart funds?

Mr. ROONEY. A great deal of the whole amount is purchased as the result of the use of foreign currencies or credits.

Now, I want the distinguished gentleman to understand that in order to use these credits on currencies which are in the Treasury of the United States, we must appropriate dollars, and that is the reason this is a dollar appropriation item, in order to get the credits and currencies out of the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that we have to buy our own money back again?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, the gentleman has been here a number of years now, and while I address these remarks to him directly, they are principally for the information of those who have not been here so long so that they may understand what happens in regard to these funds, currencies, and credits. It is all a bookkeeping transaction. The Congress must appropriate the money by way of this appropriation bill in order to get these credits or currencies out of the Treasury for use by the State Department. Does that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. No. I am not satisfied that we should appropriate 475,000 American dollars for entertainment purposes. I am not satisfied with that at all and will offer an amendment at the proper place to strike it out. I think it is a waste of the taxpayers' money and we ought to get rid of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, that may very well happen, but I feel that the committee, in unanimous agreement, did quite well when we continued this appropriation at the current level, and this is at a low level as compared with some previous years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you increase the appropriation for the construction of buildings abroad?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, that is the next item. We did not increase that appropriation dollarwise. I think the gentleman understands from reading these hearings that we have in their bill appropriated cash moneys only to the extent of \$750,000, and that \$6,250,000 is for use by way of those foreign currencies or credits which the gentleman referred to a while ago.

Mr. GROSS. I think we can very well use some of this seven-hundred-odd-million dollars in currencies owned and owed to the United States to buy farm surpluses and things of that kind. When you enlarge the building program overseas, you are going to have to send people over there to live in the buildings, and we are going to maintain this veritable army of people that we have in foreign countries.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman maintaining that the Eisenhower administration is reckless in its spending? Does he think it has gone haywire in regard to every financial policy and requested appropriation?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman maintains that it has gone on for a long time and is not being stopped fast enough.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall point out later on that there are many, many items contained in this bill which are higher today than they were in George Washington's time.

Mr. GROSS. I am not surprised at that, and the gentleman should not be surprised.

Mr. ROONEY. I will give the gentleman an example, to get on his side of the case for the moment. There has already been spent in connection with this refugee relief program of President Eisenhower's the sum of \$5,849,330 to bring 500 refugees and about 13,500 relatives of citizens and legally admitted residents into the United States. That appears at page 529 of the testimony. I think this is the worst administrative outfit ever created in Government. There is no question about that. And that is the reason we today have the controversy which someone has told me about in regard to a couple of gentlemen, both of whom come from New York.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have read the gentleman's questioning of certain witnesses before the committee, and I think he did a very good job.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Under the circumstances, I cannot understand why you provide in this bill an appropriation of \$80.5 million for the Information Service, when you disclosed in your hearings that there was rank duplication of all kinds in foreign countries; for instance, 87

American employees in Spain or employees paid by the Government in Spain.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not yielding here for a speech, I must say to the gentleman from Iowa, but I think we have adequately taken care of all these things. We went into the contents of a certain book which has been written within the past few months and which has been highly advertised and, as I understand, is a best seller today. We went through that book with its author, paragraph by paragraph, and found therein a great many misstatements. When one considers these things, one has to be fair, particularly if the writer of that book attacks everything meat ax fashion and makes untrue statements. For instance, he described a broadcast which he listened to on the liner *Queen Elizabeth* at sea on the 2d of April 1954, and he tore it apart. Among other things, he said that the principal news item carried on the BBC broadcast 15 minutes before the VOA broadcast was the battle raging at Dienbienphu in Indochina. He said that the Voice of America broadcast immediately following omitted all mention of that battle in its news program. He said that the diction of the announcer was poor, flat, and harsh; that he was like a verbose young fellow palming off his first essay before a public-speaking class at school. The committee had them produce the tape recording of that broadcast of April 2 and listened to the content and the diction of the announcers. The committee found that the first and important news of the day's broadcast by the Voice of America was that battle in Indochina. Now, when one finds a situation like this, one goes a little further. We wondered, since the gentleman had for 25 or more years been a considerable figure in the motion picture business and should have been an expert, whether or not he was qualified to attack the motion-picture program.

In his book he mentioned certain motion pictures by name. The committee looked at some 13 or 14 motion pictures, short and long, some of them of 2 hours' or more duration. The committee also looked at a long or feature-length Soviet propaganda film, *The Doomed Village*, and decided to question this author. The committee found that of the 13 or 14 motion pictures which were exhibited—we spent a day and a half doing that—he had seen only one short two-reeler. And I have a doubt as to whether or not he saw that two-reel picture because, when he was asked to point out what were the wrong slants in it, he seemed utterly unfamiliar with it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I think I shall have to proceed, I regret to say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. I know how interested the gentleman is in the Department of State and in such international organizations as UNESCO, but the gentleman will have his opportunity to speak later on.

I should like, before we use up all our time, to refer to the international educational exchange program. Is it conceivable that anyone in this House would stand for allowing \$4,110,000 to administer a \$22-million program of this kind?

Is it conceivable that anyone here would stand for this program getting off into an area where, instead of bringing foreign students to the United States, we take them from one country in Europe and send them to another country, to go to school? That was proposed in this budget submitted by the Department of State. They requested funds to send over 1,300 students from one part of Europe to another part of Europe to go to school. I do not think anyone here is going to stand for such. Furthermore, about 35,000 foreign students come to the United States every year. About 93 percent of them are brought under auspices other than the Department of State.

If the private institutions and private foundations are doing so well in bringing the bulk of these students here I think we may very well leave some of this program in a static condition appropriationwise.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wanted to ask the distinguished chairman whether we are leaving it static. We are appropriating less money under this item for this year than for last year as I see the figures in the report.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the distinguished gentleman has read the testimony and found what was the situation with regard to the failure of so many aspects of this program. For instance, they have no way of knowing, after having brought these people to this country over the years, not only as students but as leaders, as professors, what they did after they went back to their native countries. They cannot tell you whether they are on our side or on the Communist side. With reference to the Parliament in Germany, we found that we taxpayers have brought 25 percent, or 1 out of every 4 members of the lower house and 17 percent of the members of the upper house here to the United States. And when the chips were down and there arose in the German Parliament the issue whether or not they were going to stand by the United States or going to sit down with Soviet Russia, every member of the Social-Democrat Party who had been brought here, voted against us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I suggest to the gentleman he has criticized the size of the appropriation used for administrative expenses. To follow these people and to see what they do with that education when they get back to their own countries would take administrative funds, would it not?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that under the terms of the pending bill they are pretty well taken care of with regard to administrative funds. I might also point out in passing that a similar situation prevails with regard to the parliament in Paris, that we have brought to the country certain members, at the taxpayers' expense, whom we cannot depend upon when the chips are down.

Another point I must make is with regard to the fact that they bring here under this program people who have already been in the United States once, twice, or three times. That never was my

understanding of this program at its inception. I was here when it was conceived by an able and distinguished Member of the other body, who was at one time a Member of this House from the State of Arkansas. The legislation was passed on the theory that we had all these surplus property credits in connection with the property we were leaving all over the world after the war, and we were going to use those credits for this program, so that it was going to cost the taxpayers hardly a nickel. Well, we have certainly gone plenty far afield from that, and the hearings with regard to this program will show that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the fact that the committee has reduced the appropriation under last year's amount reflect thinking on the part of the committee that this program is less important this year than it was last year?

Mr. ROONEY. No, I think the action of the committee would reflect the fact that we are highly critical of the administration of this program. We do not think they should get into this business of taking foreign students from one country in Europe and sending them at our expense to another country. We think they should not bring people to this country who have previously been here. These reactions are reflected in these figures, may I say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey.

As to the Department of Justice, as a former prosecutor I was amazed to find in connection with the case of a man named Val Lorwin that there was an assistant attorney general who had been down in the Department for a number of years, who was held over by Mr. Brownell for about 16 months, who about a year after he was with Mr. Brownell went before a grand jury here in the District of Columbia without Mr. Brownell's knowledge, without the knowledge of the head of the Criminal Division, without the knowledge of the assistant heads of the Criminal Division, in other words, without anyone's knowledge, and caused the indictment of this man Lorwin, after having told the grand jury two falsehoods, one that he had two FBI informants as additional witnesses who would be ready to testify on the trial.

There was only one Government witness before that grand jury; and this prosecutor said, "We have two others whom we will produce on the trial who will back up the facts as given by this one witness." Then when the grand jury said, "We would like to hear the defendant, we would like to hear what he has to say about this," this assistant attorney general of Mr. Brownell said, "There is no sense in my subpoenaing the defendant before you because he will only raise the fifth amendment as all the Communists do." And this without any notice to the defendant.

The underlying fact in the case was that there never was a case against the defendant, and the Attorney General later had to go into the District court and dismiss the indictment.

I might also say, while I am talking about the Department of Justice, that they do not like competitive civil service. If you will refer to page 14 of the

hearings on the Department of Justice you will find this colloquy. I was addressing Mr. Brownell.

Mr. ROONEY. Here is something I would like to bring to your attention. I ran across a "good government" letter put out by the National Civil Service League:

"More patronage plums. The jobs-for-marshals drive has created a strong atmosphere of patronage in Washington. It is not surprising that the recent removal of 900 deputy United States marshal jobs from competitive civil service is viewed with wide suspicion. Deputy marshals have been under civil service since 1940. Proposals to place them in a noncompetitive classification have been opposed in the past by the league, the Hoover Commission, and the Civil Service Commission itself. The Commission attempted to explain its change of attitude in a 4-page press release stating that placing them under schedule B would be the cheaper and more practical way to fill the jobs."

What about that?

Mr. BROWNELL. I think it would be more practical and cheaper, but I think the important thing to note there is the qualifications for deputy marshals have been raised so that we expect to get a better grade of applicants.

Mr. ROONEY. But you will take them out of civil service?

Mr. BROWNELL. Out of competitive civil service.

Now, as to some of the well-known cases in the Department of Justice. After this administration took over and after they had told the American public the Government was infested with Communists, what have they done with Judy Coplon? What have they done with Mr. Foster, the kingpin of the Communists in America? He has not been tried yet. They came before the committee and pointed out that there have been 82 successful prosecutions under the Smith Act, and it turns out that 72 of those cases were investigated and the defendants were indicted before the new administration came into office.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. About a year ago there was a bill before the House which would have created a situation with respect to wiretapping which would have permitted the conviction of Judy Coplon. How did the gentleman from New York vote on that bill?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say this to the gentleman from Kentucky: when the day comes that the Congress has to legislate ex post facto with regard to a particular defendant, and when the Department of Justice with its FBI cannot get enough evidence properly and legally, after this lady had been caught turning over secret documents to an acknowledged Russian spy, then we are in a sad day.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then it is your understanding that at the present time she can be successfully prosecuted under existing law and you do not need that wiretapping law which we tried to pass here last year?

Mr. ROONEY. I see no reason to think otherwise. I think all the facts should be brought out on the table with regard to Judy Coplon. They have never been brought out as yet. We never hear the subject brought up by Mr. Brownell.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does the gentleman from Kentucky mean that Congress is asked to pass an ex post facto law for the specific purpose of dealing with this individual?

Mr. ROONEY. That was a bill which would have provided that many years after something happened, it would have made something admissible in evidence which was not admissible in evidence at the time of the happening.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Was that the sole purpose of bringing that bill before the Congress?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, I think the gentleman from Mississippi should ask that question of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, so that other Members will have some time on our side, I am going to conclude after only briefly referring to the appropriation request with regard to the judiciary. Included, therein, is the money for the referees in bankruptcy and their expenses. It appears it is expertly prognosticated that in the coming fiscal year 1956 there will be as many as 75,000 bankruptcies, the highest number in the history of the United States of America. Someone might say, "Well that only applies to 10,000 or 20,000 business concerns because included therein are the farmers and the employees and professional people." But the fact remains that a highly capable career man has prognosticated that these bankruptcies will reach the highest point in the history of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. It is also true that the income of the American people is the highest that it has ever been, and there is more prosperity in the United States than ever before.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; with regard to the first part. But that all happened during a period of time which, the gentleman will not admit, began after a thing called the Hoover depression, when we had Hoover cities and tents and people standing on breadlines.

Mr. MARTIN. Let us forget the past and get back to date. The gentleman was saying a short time ago that we were going to have a depression, and now he admits that the income of the American people is the highest it has ever been, and our prosperity is greater than ever before.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not say we were going to have a depression.

Mr. MARTIN. Your party leaders did.

Mr. ROONEY. I said we were going to have 75,000 bankruptcies in 1956 according to this testimony, the highest in the history of the country. That is what I said.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I would like to ask a question and not make a statement.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure it will be a good question.

Mr. COUDERT. I seem to recall a headline or a head note in the Times this morning indicating that the testimony to which the gentleman is now referring with respect to the number of bankruptcies is misleading and incorrect. I am not criticizing the gentleman, but the witness himself apparently stated it in such a way as to be misleading.

Mr. ROONEY. If I understand correctly, the press consulted the firm of Dun & Bradstreet. Dun & Bradstreet came along and said, "Oh, no, there will be only ten or twenty thousand bankruptcies of commercial firms." You see they do not engage in getting statistics with regard to farmers and the employed. Incidentally, right in these hearings you will find the number of bankruptcies beginning in 1900—55 years ago.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of California. Do I take it that this is a new line for the prophets of gloom; they have given up the idea of a recession and a depression and now it is bankruptcies?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman can take my remarks whichever way he cares to. We deal in facts. We do not make speeches in our hearings. We elicit answers by questions, and when we get the answers they stand in the record.

Mr. WILSON of California. But you say there are anticipated so many thousand bankruptcies. That is not a fact; that is conjecture.

Mr. ROONEY. Your colleagues on your side from the appropriations committee would take with some reliance the predictions of the gentleman who made these predictions. He is the Chief of the Bankruptcy Division. He is not someone like you and I who do not know much about bankruptcies.

In conclusion may I again say that I am grateful to all the members of the subcommittee for their hard work and their splendid efforts in bringing out this important bill. I trust it is acceptable to the House and will not be amended.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], chairman of the subcommittee, has reviewed in a general way the results of the deliberations of this committee, which constitute the substance of this bill.

I do not intend at this time to go over the ground that he has covered. All of the material is summarized in the report, and the record of several hundred pages of testimony is printed and available to Members of the House.

I do want to say, however, that I appreciate my colleague's kind words about his colleagues. For my part, I am sure the members of the minority reciprocate. I have the greatest admiration and respect for the hard-working and some-

times hard-hitting gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], our chairman and the other members of this subcommittee. I simply cannot let the occasion pass without expressing my very warm regard and respect for that other able gentleman, without whom we could scarcely function, the very able and hard-working executive secretary, Mr. Jay B. Howe.

The gentleman from New York took occasion to refer to a couple of cases handled by the Department of Justice. He took occasion to suggest some criticism at the Attorney General's Office under its present administration.

With respect to those two matters let me say to Members that if they want the full story, if they are sufficiently interested in the case of Miss Judy Coplon and Mr. Val R. Lorwin they should examine the printed record of testimony where the whole story is to be found and from which they can draw their own conclusions. For my part I have the highest respect and regard for the Attorney General. He is a first-class lawyer and able citizen. I was much impressed with the ability and knowledge of the other witnesses from the Department of Justice who appeared before this committee.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. I have a question relative to the United States Information Agency as it affects the report of the committee. As printed I notice there are several limitations written into the report. For instance, not to exceed \$300,000 is provided for the "presentation" program; not to exceed \$200,000 is provided for exhibits for which \$334,000 was requested, and other limitations of that type.

I am wondering if the fact that these limitations appear in the report make them actual limitations in law. I notice they are not mentioned in the bill itself, and I wonder if the committee regards them as binding on the agency, because there are many serious limitations, particularly in regard to exhibits, for example. I would just like to hear the opinion of the chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. I may say to the gentleman from California that it is expected that they will be the law; and that they are binding. The fact that they have not been inserted in the bill is not important. They represent the considered judgment of the committee and we expect the language of the report to be followed.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of California. Are limitations written in a committee report such as this, but not written into the wording of the legislation, binding?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. That is a matter to be settled by the members of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILSON of California. I merely wanted it for my own understanding and information, for I am fairly new here.

It seems to me rather unusual to consider matter written into a report of the same binding effect on an administrator as though written into the law itself.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not the prerogative of the Chair to pass upon the sufficiency or insufficiency of a committee report.

Mr. WILSON of California. I am not really asking whether the report itself is sufficient or insufficient; I am asking whether the legislation we are voting on here is sufficient or insufficient.

The committee report on the appropriation bill now before the House includes recommendations on maximum amounts to be available to the USIA for certain specified functions. The recommendations appear to be intended as limitations. No comparable limitations are contained in the bill appropriating funds to USIA.

I should like to point out that recommendations contained in a report of a committee of the House can have no legal force. Such recommendations do not reflect the will of the House. The Members of the House do not have an opportunity to accept or reject the limitations, or to otherwise amend them since there is no established procedure for the House to amend committee reports.

Legislation can be enacted only by the joint action of the House and Senate and the President. Legislation cannot be unilaterally enacted by a committee of the Congress. Naturally the committee recommendations are to be given due weight by the executive agencies in the administration of the programs concerned. These recommendations are the result of the arduous labors of conscientious legislators. They are not to be lightly ignored or disregarded by the executive arm of the Government. They are not, however, legislative mandates having the force of law.

I am firmly of the above view and understand that my view is shared by the General Counsel of the General Accounting Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman might address that inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman; will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me say once again that the language in the report with regard to these limitations is a matter of custom which has been followed over many years, and it is expected that the USIA and the departments involved in this bill will strictly follow the language of the report unless the will of the House demonstrates otherwise by adopting amendments to the bill.

I cannot make it more clear.

Mr. COUDERT. I have now before me the column from the New York Times of this morning, April 14, with respect to the subject of the 75,000 bankruptcies referred to by the chairman of this subcommittee a few moments ago. The headline is "Failure Figures Just Fail To Jibe—Alarming Forecast in House Report Traced to Error in Comparing Data—No Rise in Bankruptcies—Furore Finally Liquidated—Misleading Estimate Aided Court Budget, Anyhow."

That is the headline and the subcaption. Then as you go down the column—there is an entire column of it—you read this:

The Dun & Bradstreet's spokesman termed the 75,000 figure fantastic, saying that the witness could not possibly have been talking about business failures which totaled 11,000 last year and are expected to run about the same total this year. Dun & Bradstreet list among bankruptcies any enterprises that go out of business on account of lack of money.

The spokesman compared the 1954 total of 11,086 failures with a total of 117,164 new enterprises that started up during the same period.

I read that into the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, merely to clarify the situation so that there will not be any misunderstanding. I think my friend from New York did make that clear generally at the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. In order to further clarify the situation I would appreciate it if the gentleman would permit me to read into the RECORD the following brief paragraph from the testimony, appearing at page 115 of the committee hearings with regard to the Judiciary:

The upward trend began in 1953 when 40,087 cases were filed, and it has continued through the fiscal year 1954 when new filings totaled 53,136. This represents a numerical increase of 13,049 over 1953, which is by far the largest numerical increase in any year since the salary system began. The percentage increase was 32.55 percent. There are strong indications that the upward trend will continue and that approximately 65,000 cases will be filed in 1955, and that the total increase to 75,000 in 1956 can be expected.

I may say that the salary system began in 1946 or thereabouts.

Mr. Covey has been the head of the bankruptcy division and connected with the administration of referees in bankruptcies since 1942. If he were not such a capable gentleman I do not suppose he would be there now. So I am willing to take the figures of this capable gentleman who testified before the committee rather than this story of Dun & Bradstreet's.

Mr. COUDERT. All I had in mind was to make sure there is no misunderstanding. I do not question the figures presented, they may be right, they may be wrong, and by referring to Dun & Bradstreet it merely puts the whole situation in proper perspective.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman will recall that the figures of Mr. Covey with regard to predicting the number of bankruptcies over the years has been uncanny, uncanny in the fact they have been accurate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that Mr. Hoover, Jr., the son of one of our great and illustrious Presidents, has added a great deal to the efficiency of the Department of State? I find him able, fine, and kindly, and very helpful to his country.

Mr. COUDERT. For my own part, I entirely subscribe to the gentleman's observations about Mr. Hoover, Jr. I am sure he has been a very great, powerful, and useful addition to the staff of the Department of State.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Former President Hoover must be extremely gratified that his son was confirmed by the Senate without a dissenting vote.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say to the charming gentlewoman from Massachusetts that Undersecretary Hoover is a charming gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And very able.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to ask my good friend from New York some questions about an item on page 3 of the report under the heading "Contributions to International Organizations." I refer specifically to the amount of \$1.6 million plus for the International Labor Organization. I understand that is an increase over the previous appropriation of about \$106 million, and I wonder if the gentleman could tell the committee why it was necessary to make an increase in our contribution.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman has inadvertently quoted an incorrect figure. The amount appropriated for the current year was \$1.5 million plus and the amount requested was \$1.6 million plus, which represents a requested increase of \$106,378.

Mr. BENTLEY. I accept the correction. But, I would still like to ask the gentleman about the increase of \$106,000.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe the increase, as related to the committee by Ambassador Lodge, is based on a general increase. It is the United States share, our part of the contributions to ILO.

Mr. BENTLEY. I believe the gentleman will confirm me when I say that our percentage of contribution to the total budget is about 25 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I think I should answer the gentleman this way, that the total assessment budget for the calendar year 1955, which compares with this bill, fiscal year 1956, approved by the 37th international labor conference, amounts to \$6,990,913 or \$434,026 more than the comparative figure for the calendar year 1954, fiscal 1955. The primary factors responsible for this increase are the salary increases, travel attributed to home leave, and increase in field work program. The United States share remains the same as it has been, to wit, 25 percent.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman and his committee looked into the very serious problem which I understand exists with respect to the ILO at the present time. I am specifically referring to the fact that among the Communist delegations to that conference, although their delegations, like ours, are

supposed to be divided into three groups, namely, an employer delegation, a worker delegation, and a government delegation, actually the delegates from the Communist countries are all government delegates. I wonder if the gentleman's committee considered that problem at all.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee does, as far as possible, try to stay away from policy matters and legislative matters which are properly within the confines of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. This budget was presented to the committee by Ambassador Lodge and his staff. The committee found no reason to complain with it. It might surprise the gentleman if we were to say that the majority members have some confidence in Ambassador Lodge, as do the minority members. He is a fine American, he makes a fine presentation, and he makes a forthright statement, but I regret to say that the committee did not probe into this matter the gentleman from Michigan mentions.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I personally consider it unwise that our worker delegates to that conference, appointed by the AFL and the CIO, and our employer delegates, appointed by the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce, are forced to sit down with so-called worker and employer delegates who are nothing but mouthpieces of their Communist satellite governments. I might point out further that I understand on the part of our employer organization, because of the situation which is existing at the present time, there is some question as to whether in the future we should send employer delegates to ILO conferences.

Mr. ROONEY. I deplore the existence of this situation which the gentleman describes. But when we have our U. N. affairs in the hands of Ambassador Lodge, who is busy with this whole problem of the U. N. and international organizations, I wonder if it is something that one should decide here on the floor of the House in a few minutes rather than leave it to Ambassador Lodge, sitting before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and going over the subject in detail with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I may say that I have no intention of offering any amendments with respect to our contribution to the ILO, but I do hope that the gentleman, in spite of the respect that he and I both have for Ambassador Lodge, would consider the question of our contributions to the organization and perhaps the question of our membership in the organization as one for the Congress, both his committee and mine, a question to which we should give serious consideration in the future.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman does not propose that we should take the United States out of the International Labor Organization without very mature consideration. As a matter of fact, my first reaction would be one of opposition to such a proposal.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman. I wonder if the gentleman, in the time remaining, would answer 1 or 2

questions about the appropriations for the USIA.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall try to.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether any breakdown was furnished with the request by that organization of \$88.5 million, of the increases over the 1955 appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, there was.

Mr. BENTLEY. Am I correct in assuming that about two-thirds of the requested increase was for appropriations to carry on the work of overseas missions in certain geographic areas?

Mr. ROONEY. That would be correct.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with how much of that money went to the so-called Near East.

Mr. ROONEY. The amount of the increase to the Near East would come to approximately 50 percent of the requested increase. USIA overseas operations totaled \$4,518,000, and \$2,023,000 was proposed to be used for missions in the Near East.

Mr. BENTLEY. Does the gentleman have a country breakdown of the allocations in the Near East?

Mr. ROONEY. We do.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman could make a comparison between the amount allocated for India on one hand and the amount allocated for countries of the Middle East and Africa on the other hand. Those are all the questions I have at the present time.

Mr. ROONEY. Those are a couple of good questions, I must say to the gentleman. With regard to India, the 1956 estimated expenses for 8 posts, 65 Americans, and 472 locals, would be \$2,171,700, whereas the figure with regard to—would the gentleman want the figure for Iran?

Mr. BENTLEY. Would the gentleman tell me if I am correct in this? Would it not be very unfortunate that there was more money requested for India alone—I believe nearly three times as much—as all of the requested increase for Israel, the Arab States, and the entire continent of Africa?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that is a fair statement; that is, that by far the largest amount requested was for India. I want the gentleman to understand that we are now talking only about the estimated or requested amounts, before the scalpel was used by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman, in considering the committee recommendation of \$28,079,977 for our contributions to international organizations, I wish to call attention to the amount of \$1,633,855 for the International Labor Organization.

According to the Secretary of State, our estimated contribution for the current fiscal year to this organization is \$1,527,477, representing 25 percent of the entire organization budget. Now we are asked to approve an increase of more than \$106,000 to this organization about which I have very grave misgivings in-

deed. I might add that our contribution to the ILO has increased from \$532,000 in fiscal 1946 to the figure which the committee is asking for today and which represents the largest contribution, if approved, which we have yet made to that organization in any one fiscal year.

One of the gravest reasons for my misgivings concerning this organization, Mr. Chairman, lies in the large number of worker and employer delegates to the international conferences of the ILO who are selected by governments rather than by private organizations. Now in this country the CIO and the A. F. of L. select our worker delegates and the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce select our employer delegates. But at these international meetings they are brought face to face with Communist delegates who are not representative of worker or employer organizations in their country, but instead, are mere mouthpieces of the various Communist governments which accredit them.

In the fall of 1953, I participated in a special study mission on international organizations and movements which, at the direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, spent a month in Western Europe studying these organizations and movements. We found, for example, that the credentials committee of the ILO and the conference itself had approved the seatings of a Czech Government official as an employer delegate in spite of the fact that the ILO constitution itself says that an employer representative must be nongovernmental. This appears to me to be a clear violation of the ILO constitution and is one of the reasons for my grave misgivings regarding our participation in an organization which operates thusly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the sixth annual report from the United States employers' delegation to the 1954 International Labor Conference. The report calls attention to the influx of Communist nations into the ILO, especially at the 1954 Conference. It further points out that this Communist invasion resulted in an impetus to greater solidarity among the employer representatives of the free world, brought about a sharp cleavage within the normally solid worker group to which the United States worker delegation was a happy exception, and left a general impression of unwillingness on the part of most governments to clash with the Communists in the ILO.

I understand that the admission of Communist nations to ILO membership and the decision of the Conference to accept and seat Russian-defined employer and worker representatives from Iron Curtain countries has raised the broad question as to whether or not United States employers should continue to participate in the Organization. I understand that this question is still under consideration by the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

At this time, I would like to say that the employers' last report did not contain the usual progress report and made no recommendations in view of the fact

that the entire question of future participation by United States employers is at stake. The report did, however, contain the following paragraph which may prove enlightening to the committee:

We cannot credit the ILO staff with any less bias than in the past. The attitude of the staff toward the Communist problem was strictly one of self-preservation. Naturally they would look with disfavor upon any move that might jeopardize their secure positions in an international agency. We cannot at all subscribe to the undue influence which the staff exerts on many occasions in many meetings at an ILO conference.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our Government has been quite strong in its support of the ILO for many years. Organized labor in the United States, as well as the major business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have, by their active participation in ILO activities, rendered strong moral support to the organization. There has, of course, been criticism based upon the fact that a number of proposals taken up by the ILO are not compatible with the free enterprise, free collective bargaining concepts which prevail in this country.

Also, the fact that ILO conventions are subject to ratification as treaty law has been a cause of concern in management circles and has been one of the primary sources of United States criticism of the ILO. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I am firmly opposed to the fact that proposals passed by the ILO take a form which is subject to ratification as a multilateral treaty. I have been informed by the Department of Commerce that they too are similarly opposed to the use of the convention as an ILO instrument on any subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that Assistant Secretary Wilkins, of the Department of Labor, has been doing a very good job in representing the United States in the ILO and, further, I think that the United States representation is now much improved and much stronger than it has been in the past. To some extent, the Soviet entry into the ILO has had a salutary effect in unifying the position of the free nations and in bringing employer and worker delegates of the free nations closer together on many issues where in the past they have been divided.

Nevertheless, I remind the Committee again that employer and worker delegates from the Soviet bloc nations have been seated even though these delegates are not true representatives of employers or workers but are, in fact, government representatives. There is no question but that since the Communist countries were given representation on industry committees by the ILO governing body, the activities of these committees have been hampered, to say nothing of the fact that it gives the Communists another platform for propaganda purposes.

I am not going to oppose the appropriation made for the ILO by the Appropriations Committee. But there is one more fact to which I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues. The total

1956 ILO budget is approximately \$7.5 million, of which more than \$3.7 million is for salaries and wages of the international secretariat. Just about half of the whole budget. I understand that the director general requested from the governing body a total of 85 new jobs and received approval for 51 of these. Now, this obviously means an expansion of this organization beyond anything in the past, and to the extent that we continue to furnish our proportionate share of the budget, it will require larger and larger contributions from this Government in the future. In this same connection, I understand that the total ILO budget for 1956 represents an increase of \$450,000 over the 1955 budget, to which must be added an amount of \$250,000, which is now in a capital fund. In other words, the organization figures to spend about \$700,000 more in 1956 than they are spending in the current calendar year.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I do not intend to vote against this requested appropriation, but I call the attention of the committee to the fact that there are serious doubts among responsible quarters as to the value of our continued participation in this organization which seems to be embarked on a very real program of growth. I strongly urge that future contributions to this organization be made with the foregoing facts in mind.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

I understand that the budget estimate for this purpose totaled \$88.5 million, representing an increase of \$11,386,000 over the amount appropriated in the current fiscal year. I further understand that this increase is distributed as follows: \$8.4 million for the agency's overseas missions to carry out stepped-up United States information programs in the American republics area; the Far East; and the Near East—there being no increase for Europe; \$1.3 million for more effective backstopping of the overseas mission by domestic media services—motion picture, press, and information center services—these costs being nonallocable by area; \$1.5 million for increased Voice of America activities, including funds for television development; \$100,000 to promote increased cooperation in information activities by private enterprises and groups; \$175,000 to strengthen the agency's research and intelligence functions; and a decrease of \$75,000 in overhead administration costs. The committee has unanimously reduced this budget estimate to \$80.5 million which is actually an increase of better than \$4 million over the 1955 appropriations when certain nonrecurring costs are figured in.

The Information Agency advises as follows:

The fiscal year 1956 budget for the United States Information Agency anticipates a world situation in which it will be more necessary than ever for United States policies and actions to be understood overseas, and for the United States to have a strong program capable of counteracting hostile Communist propaganda throughout the world. The fiscal year 1956 budget request of \$88.5 million is approximately the same as the \$89 million request for fiscal year 1955 trans-

mitted to Congress by the President last spring. Congress cut the 1955 request back to \$77.1 million or to about the level of fiscal year 1954, excluding nonrecurring liquidation costs. This 1954 level represented a severe 37 percent cut from funds available to the information program in fiscal year 1953. At the time, it was understood that this reduction was made to give the new United States Information Agency an opportunity to reorganize, review its operations, and personnel, and sharpen its objectives. It was anticipated that the Agency would be given more adequate funds following the reorganization period. The Agency has had over 18 months' experience at the level of operation to which it was cut in fiscal year 1954. Numerous shifts have been made in country programs, so as to concentrate resources in countries and areas with highest priorities. Despite these shifts, which were designed to achieve greatest effectiveness with the funds at hand, the demands on the Agency in specific priority areas and countries cannot be adequately met without the increased budget requested for fiscal year 1956. This 1956 budget is a careful estimate of the increases the Agency requires to enable it to meet its responsibilities; it is based primarily on items prepared by public affairs officers in each country in which the Agency operates on the strength of carefully worked-out world, area, and country, objectives.

There, Mr. Chairman, you have the position of the Agency in requesting its 1956 fiscal budget estimate. Now I have always been in favor of a strong overseas information program. My thoughts in this direction are perhaps best expressed by the following statement which I made on the radio program America's Town Meeting of the Air on a program on July 21, 1953, and entitled "How Can We Compete With Communist Propaganda?" My opening remarks at that time were as follows:

In discussing this subject: How Can We Compete With Communist Propaganda? one important fact must be kept in mind. The most successful Communist propaganda is not openly labeled as such. Propaganda which has an evident, unquestioned Moscow origin rarely attracts much sympathy except among those who are already devoted party-liners. When the hand of the Kremlin is not so visible, such as in the case of the famous Stockholm peace petition, there are many sincere and well-meaning individuals who are likely to fall for the Communist bait.

And the same is true of its exponents. Fellow travelers, either through intent or gullibility, are always more convincing mouthpieces than outright party members. To compete successfully with Communist propaganda, the type of individual concerned must be carefully considered. Arguments which might be useful with a British coal miner could hardly be used with a Bolivian Indian or a Chinese coolie. But every human being seeks freedom in some form—whether freedom from want, from fear, or what have you. And to the extent that we can show the basic opposition of Soviet communism to freedom in any form, and to the extent that this Government can stand for the rights of freedom in turn, to that extent will our opposition be successful.

But this does not involve attempting to remake the world in our own image. Too often in the past our efforts to export an American standard of living, without proper educational preparation, have aroused resentment and jealousy, instead of exciting friendship and admiration. If people have freedom, they should then be permitted to develop themselves and cultures in their

own way—a way in which neither capitalism nor socialism may predominate.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that since the President's Reorganization Plan No. 8 was put into effect, our overseas information program has been measurably strengthened and has resulted in a more effective job of salesmanship abroad. I do not intend to oppose the committee's reduced figures although, frankly, there are certain places where I would even support a large appropriation. I hope the other body will restore some of these cuts, specifically in the programs relating to certain geographic areas.

I presume, however, that the committee is aware that the agency has unrestricted authority to transfer program funds between geographic areas as it sees fit to do so. I question, therefore, whether the geographic designation of program funds really means very much in the final analysis. Now with regard to the stepped-up program increases in Latin America, I understand that these increases are earmarked for six countries. Although I would approve of an increased program in, say, Guatemala, I think the question of our economic assistance there is of even greater importance in view of the fact that country was left practically bankrupt after the Communist government was ousted last summer. All the information activities in the world will be practically valueless unless the Guatemalan economy receives a much-needed shot in the arm.

No program increase has been contemplated for Europe. Regarding the Far East, I think the requested amount of \$11.9 million, representing an increase of more than \$2.5 million, is a necessary one and I hope that our programs there will be stepped up, in view of the critical developments taking place in that part of the world.

There is a requested boost of more than \$3.6 million for the Near East, south Asia and Africa. I was amazed to discover how disproportionate such an increase has become. I would be completely unable, for example, to explain or justify a requested program of \$1.4 million for India alone while the entire area of the Middle East, including Israel and the Arab States, as well as the entire African Continent, only receive a little more than half a million dollars' increase. I must confess I cannot understand the thinking which guided such an allocation of program funds.

I am not disposed to quarrel with the increases requested for the Voice of America. I understand that approximately three-fourths of its programs are beamed behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and their effectiveness is shown by the large efforts of the Soviets to jam or otherwise disrupt such transmissions. In spite of this Communist counterpropaganda, however, the Voice of America is getting through. A young resident of Michigan, John Noble, who was recently freed after 9 years' imprisonment in a Soviet slave-labor camp, told me that even at Vorkuta, in Siberia and north of the Arctic Circle, the Voice was heard. I have not always admired the content of some of the Voice's programs but, on the whole, I think it is

doing a commendable job and I approve of increased appropriations for this purpose.

However, I have grave misgivings about the requested \$1.3 million increase requested by the Agency for nonallocable domestic media services, that is, nonallocable by area. This represents merely a request to make the program larger in order to buy more films, pamphlets, books, and so forth, for worldwide use. The committee has properly criticized the way in which funds have been spent for such purposes in the past and I myself would be unwilling to support further increases in this direction at this time.

I agree with the committee that the USIA budget that was presented was not a tight budget. I agree that substantial savings could be effected in this program. Further, I believe that the budget puts too much money into certain geographic areas to the neglect of others equally if not more important to this country's national security.

I think our overseas information program has vastly improved in the last 2 years but is still a long way from perfection. I hope efforts will be made in the future to realize an even more dynamic and positive role in the cold war. I intend to vote for the committee figures although I think in some places the cuts have been too drastic and in others they may not have gone far enough. But I am sure my colleagues will realize the importance of strengthening our worldwide propaganda activities and will vote to support this amount.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring to the House some of the facts as they have been presented to me at various times relative to the international educational exchange program and the possible effects of the—to me—very drastic cut.

I think in many instances there is a good deal of misunderstanding about this whole program and which exchange students belong to the educational program and the administration's program and which are privately helped, and the different values of each group.

The report of the House Committee on Appropriations on international educational exchange activities for the fiscal year 1956 has noted that there were 33,833 foreign students in the United States in the academic year 1953-54. The committee concluded that approval or denial of funds for the Department's foreign student program would not have a great impact on the coming of foreign students to the United States.

A considerable part—more than one-third of the total foreign student population—of the movement of foreign students to the United States is unrelated to the country programs of the Department of State. For instance, 4,775 students were from Canada, with which the Department of State has no exchange program; a large number were refugee students from Iron-Curtain countries, including almost 2,500 stranded Chinese students; and an undeter-

mined number were students on immigration visas, who plan to remain in the United States. Such exchanges place a premium on the student who can afford to come to the United States instead of the one who should come. As a result, certain fields in which this Government is particularly interested—for example, American studies—are often not represented at all.

In striking contrast to these privately supported exchanges are the Department grantees who are selected after rigorous competitions. These students, outstanding in character and quality, are already key young people of great potentiality for future leadership in their own countries—most of them already launched on their careers. The term "student" as applied to these grantees is intended only to describe their activity in the United States; three-fourths of them are young professional persons in the 25-35 age group—teachers, journalists, government officials, lawyers, representatives of labor and of management, and so forth.

The Department brings these people to the United States to specialize in fields of particular importance to this country. Some are brought in small groups for especially tailored programs at universities possessing special resources in certain fields—representative government projects, labor-management industrial-relations projects, comparative law projects, and the like. In 1953-54, for example, 549 of these students were teachers at all levels or educational administrators in their home countries. Still others are selected, regardless of field, entirely because of the potential for future leadership that they have revealed.

In many countries in which it is particularly significant that we develop better understanding toward the United States, the Department's foreign-student program represents from 15 percent to 50 percent of the total number of foreign nationals from these countries studying in the United States.

In addition to limiting the Department's opportunity to improve mutual understanding between the United States and these countries, the elimination of reduction of the Department's student program would result in a decrease, rather than an increase, in private support of student exchanges in these and other countries. The Department's program gives concrete evidence of this Government's interest in promoting such exchanges and thus stimulates voluntary agencies and institutions to earmark some of their own resources for this purpose.

Further, much of the private financial support for the program now utilized would go to waste if it could not be supplemented by funds from the Department made available through congressional appropriations. Approximately two-thirds of the foreign nationals who obtain study grants under the Department's program obtain most of their funds from private sources with only supplemental funds supplied by the Department. Without these supplemental funds, most of these highly qualified persons presently being selected by the

Department would be unable to realize their educational experiences in the United States.

Similarly, the program for American students stresses high standards of selection and planned study projects which contribute to objectives of mutual understanding and are productive for the individuals concerned. This factor of planning for desired results cannot be present in the undirected movement of individual private students of varied purposes and qualifications.

Approximately 900 exchange students were abroad under the program in 1954. This contrasts with an estimated 2,359 students studying abroad but not under the Department, as reported in a survey made in 1953. American students abroad on their own resources include members in such countries as Canada, in which the Department has no program, undergraduates in a variety of fields, and students taking several years of specialized training, such as medicine. These students are largely self-supported.

The Department's program offers grants only to students who have entered a rigorous competition, judged by selective screening committees on college campuses, in each State and a national committee. Awards are restricted to students doing graduate study, who are mature enough to accomplish independent work of value in a year's time and to adjust to different educational and social conditions. They engage in study in fields which have been recommended as offering special facilities not available in the United States, often subjects in which there is a paucity of trained individuals in this country.

As unofficial ambassadors, the American students demonstrate to their foreign friends the high qualities of educational and personal excellence found in the young people of this country. Students under the program do not enter the universities haphazardly according to undirected choice; they are placed with careful consideration in the university best suited to the productive pursuit of their study. Before they begin the regular university sessions, they attend orientation programs to brief them on the customs and problems of the country and give them a complete understanding of the objectives of the program and their role in advancing international understanding.

Students who go abroad on their own resources are, of course, those with the financial ability to do so and not necessarily those who can either personally or academically gain from the experience or who represent the highest type of American youth. The educational exchange program sends abroad many excellent students who would be financially unable to go on their own, thus enabling the participation of persons and communities who would otherwise not have this experience. The presence abroad of well-qualified Americans, selected on the basis of merit, is effective in combating the rather prevalent opinion abroad that Americans are solely materialistic and lacking in cultural and educational excellence.

It would appear from these facts, therefore, that a serious reduction in the Department's student-exchange program which would result from the cuts in this bill, would eliminate from the general flow of students a very important group that is presently contributing significantly to the promotion of international goodwill and understanding basic to world peace.

May I insert at this point in my remarks two paragraphs from the report of the Special Study Mission to Southeast Asia and the Pacific. The study mission included Congressmen Judd, Church, Adair, and Zablocki who made the trip in 1953, where they saw the tremendous importance of the exchange students in those areas.

The exchange program in this part of the world (that is southeast Asia and the Pacific) is particularly important because of the preference previously shown by students for European university training. There has been a long-standing impression in much of the Orient that European universities provide better training in academic subjects while American schools stress primarily technical subjects. The students and leaders who have had the opportunity to study in this country have not regretted their experience and are correcting this erroneous impression.

The exchange program has already demonstrated its value. The individuals with whom the study mission spoke regarded their American experience as contributing immeasurably to their work and to a better attitude toward the United States. The study mission recommends that the program not only be continued but that it be expanded. What it can mean in terms of providing influence within the countries in this critical period of their national history is best seen in Indonesia where about 100 labor leaders have studied in Moscow or Peking. They provide the leadership for about 75 percent of organized labor.

Upon inquiry in regard to the point made by the very distinguished gentleman from New York in the matter of our sending students from one European country to another European country, I find that out of an appropriation request of \$22 million, only \$35,154 would be devoted to grants to students for study in such so-called third countries. This money would be used to send two students from Iraq to study at the American University in Beirut and some 220 students to the well known Salzburg Seminar in American Studies in Austria, and at certain American institutions which have been inspired by the Salzburg Seminar and which utilize the hospitality and facilities of universities in Norway and Holland. Provision for such limited studies in American institutions in so-called third countries are explicitly authorized by the Fulbright Act and carried out under the supervision of the Board of Foreign Scholarships appointed by the President of the United States from among distinguished educators to supervise the educational aspects of this program.

The rest of the 1,300 are given grants to attend similar American institutions in their own country under the authority of the Fulbright Act. Only \$2,200 in all—in United States foreign currency equivalent—out of the total requested

\$22 million is spent on these 1,300—1,354—grants.

I inquired also relative to the giving of scholarships twice to the same individual.

As a matter of policy and practice, grants are not given to persons who have previously visited the United States. Exceptions to this rule are rare and are restricted to persons who, because of their present prominence or influence or because of the special purpose of such a visit are awarded grants to carry out specific activities in this country. A recent survey of this situation reveals that these "second grants" are extremely rare; they have been given notably to certain outstanding governmental figures in key European countries, who may have visited this country years ago. Even these cases are extremely rare and are considered highly unusual.

May I turn to the financial picture for a moment, Mr. Chairman. Of the \$22 million requested by the Department of State for its International Educational Exchange activities, \$8.2 million was to be used for the purchase of foreign currencies.

Of the \$12 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee for this program, \$8 million is specified to be used to purchase foreign currencies.

Thus the effect of the committee's action was to reduce the funds available for use in dollars by 10 million, leaving the sum of foreign currencies almost untouched.

The \$4 million available in United States dollars under the committee's recommendation is insufficient to pay the dollar cost for this program in the United States. These dollar costs include (a) administration; (b) dollar support grants in the United States; and (c) the balance of the program throughout the world—for example, Latin America, where no foreign currencies are available.

Even where foreign currencies are used, certain categories, leaders, and specialists, are excluded from foreign currency grants and must be paid in dollars.

Foreign currencies are used by the Department to the greatest extent available and possible, but even these must be supplemented by dollars for expenses in the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, in the report on appropriations for the international exchange activities of the Department of State, the Appropriations Committee has commented that "certain limitations on expenditures for programs which admittedly are of some value but which cannot be classified as necessary must be made." I do not believe that the exchange program is a luxury. It is a necessary arm of our foreign relations. It has proved one of the most effective means at our disposal to influence those

foreign nationals who are directly or indirectly responsible for molding public opinion in their respective countries. The comparatively modest outlay of Government funds asked by this agency for this program has several values.

For these reasons it is sometimes necessary to carry out exchange projects which are timely and required by the international situation. In other instances, worthwhile projects would not be undertaken and would not receive nearly as much acceptance abroad if it were not for the official endorsement and support of our Government. Similarly, in this country, the endorsement and support of such projects by our Government serves as a very real inducement to private initiative and cooperation in this field.

Many of you are aware of the stringency of college budgets in this country today. These institutions realize the benefits they receive from having foreign students and lecturers on their campuses and for this reason are willing to put up partial scholarships as far as their budgets will allow. If the Government were not able to match these funds, many of these opportunities would have to be withdrawn.

The committee also appears to be concerned about the very large expenditures for international exchange programs of this Government and the possible duplication of effort as between the State Department's program and those of the Foreign Operations Administration. This concern appears to be based on the assumption that the \$136,528,000 shown as the cost for the FOA 1955 technical cooperation program is all spent for exchange of persons. Actually only about \$13.8 million is being spent to bring foreign technicians for training in the United States. This is the only part of the FOA program which is directly comparable with the activities of the International Educational Exchange Service. The balance of FOA's Technical Cooperation budget is for sending Government- and contract-employed United States technicians to work overseas—about \$37 million—and for contract services, supplies, equipment, grants to cooperative agencies, and other costs which are a part of the technical cooperation program but which are not comparable with the exchange program.

There also appears to be some confusion concerning the differing purposes of these two programs. The distinction between the exchange of persons incidental to the technical assistance program of the Foreign Operations Administration and the educational exchange program was clearly pointed out in the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on H. R. 9678 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, which says in paragraph 59 of section 107:

In authorizing legislation for development assistance and technical cooperation, the intent of Congress was that such activities be oriented toward specific economic and technical objectives, leaving the noneconomically oriented activities authorized by the Smith-Mundt Act to the more perma-

nent program carried out by the State Department.

If one could summarize in one phrase the difference between these two programs, one might say the FOA's programs emphasize know how and the Department's, know why.

Certain military and economic aid are important and necessary. However, they are no substitute for a permanent program to lay a solid base of mutual understanding expressed in the legislation authorizing the educational exchange program. A drastic reduction in this program will confirm what many people abroad say about us—that we care only about military expediency and have no real interest in their problems and their aspirations and do not really want them as friends in building a free society of coequal nations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, Red Russia and Red China are mass-producing engineers, doctors, physicists, and other scientists at a rate which has not been before approached in world history.

The metropolitan press and various trade journals have reflected the growing alarm of the free world because of this situation. During the last quarter of 1954 and in the first quarter of 1955, production experts throughout the United States have called attention to the assembly-line method of graduating trained technicians from the schools of higher learning in the chief Communist countries.

It is high time that this situation be subjected to critical examination in the House of Representatives.

The most frequently quoted figure is that, in 1954, 150,000 trained technicians completed their training in the Soviet Union's colleges and universities. This compares to approximately half of that number graduated from similar institutions in the United States. The next most frequently quoted figure is that there is, at present, some 250,000 students engaged in higher education in Red China; and that approximately two-thirds of that number are working toward degrees in some phase of technical study.

The impact of the release upon the world of millions of technically trained men and women, dedicated to conquest for the Communists, is enormous.

Americans are naturally inclined to look upon this development as a menace. Reckoned in terms of tanks, planes, and atom and hydrogen bombs—it is a menace. These mass-produced technicians are literally guns aimed at America.

Shortly after my return from an inspection tour abroad, during which I spent several weeks in the U. S. S. R., General Ridgway declared in a speech before the West Point Society of New

York, that the Kremlin had in the neighborhood of 20,000 military planes available for use at that time. Those planes are efficient planes. Our Air Force knows that from its Korean experience. When I was in Russia, I saw many planes—chiefly the IL-10 and MIG-15 types—around airbases. I did not see many large planes. And I had it forcibly brought to my notice that numerous commercial and jet planes land on sod runways, even when concrete runways could be used.

While no figures are at hand to substantiate this, it is a reasonable conjecture that high priority in the system is given to the technical training of all experts connected with the Soviet Air Force—from plane construction, plane flying, and plane armament to those charged with building air strips.

The guns side of the guns-and-butter dispute have the best of it in the Kremlin. The cream of the crop of Soviet technicians have been siphoned off by heavy war industries, leaving only the skim-milk technicians for consumer goods.

You are a Russian. You make good money. You are of the elite. You are permitted to buy a TV set. You must pay from \$400 to \$700 for a 17-inch picture. In Moscow, where the best programing prevails, you may watch from 7 p. m. until midnight over two channels. There is not an oversupply of TV technicians available to John Q. Soviet.

Suppose you are a Russian. You have been cleared of any suspicion of deviating from the party line. Your parents and grandparents have been investigated. You are close to commissar rank. You are allowed to buy an automobile. No. You do not go to the used-car lot of Manny, the Maniac. You buy from the state. Perhaps, you want a four-door model. The Pobeda comes in that class. It is much like a 1940 model of a Ford or Chevrolet. You can get it, if you wait a year, and if you have \$4,000. Perhaps, you are very high in the party. Then, you just might get a Zis, which looks like the 1942-model Packard, or the Zim, resembling the 1946 Buick. You would have to pay practically double the amount you would pay for a 1955 Packard or a 1955 Buick in the United States of America.

More than likely, you would settle for a Moskvich, patterned after a 1947 German car, or a Paveda, a great deal like our jeeps.

The private automobile industry did not draft too many topflight technicians from the Soviet institutions of higher learning. The director of one of the automobile factories talked to me. He worked in Detroit in 1936. He gets the Russian equivalent of \$15,000 a year. His salary has the buying power of less than \$5,000.

You are a Russian. You are a telephone subscriber. You get more than your fair share of wrong numbers. That is logical, because the Moscow telephone directory is merely 2 years out of date.

You are a Russian. You cannot afford a TV set. You cannot afford an automobile. But you are better off than most of your comrades. How about

shopping in the spacious Gum department store on Red Square? Better put on your heavy coat. The building is cold. Better have your official papers with you. Have them up to date, signed, and countersigned. Or you will not even be able to get in the store. Get in a line. Wait your turn. Buy what they let you buy—not what you want. The clothing and shoe business, from producer-manufacturer to sales counter, could do with a few well-trained technicians. What you buy is very little and of poor quality. It costs many times what the same articles would bring in capitalist America.

You are a Russian. You are tired and cold from your shopping expedition. You want something to eat, warmth, a bath, and rest. You go home. You are lucky. You live in an apartment building. You warm yourself at a stove that would have been old fashioned 20 years ago in the United States. You share that stove with the equivalent of the Smiths, the Joneses, and the Browns. You get your cheese and sausage out of an icebox which also serves the Smiths, the Joneses, and the Browns. You wait your turn for a bath in cold water in a communal bathtub. Comrade, this is really communism, with a big "C."

You are still a Russian. You are sick. It is easy to get sick in poorly lighted, cold factories while working 12 to 16 hours a day, over machinery not designed to protect you. You are sent to a hospital. The beds are small, with sagging straw mattresses. Your surgeon is dressed in a 15-year-old suit and a necktie worn out from use. He gives you a local anesthetic, for nearly all operations are handled in this way. The operating room and the therapy division are quite modern. Their equipment was the latest thing in medical science in 1943.

Commissar, can you spare a technician?

You are a Russian. You are a farmer. You are an agricultural college graduate. You work on a collective farm. You have seen many mechanical farm implements at Moscow in exhibitions. You have a few of these marvels. Not many. Your superior tells the world you surpass the world in raising hogs. Your superior petitions his superior to petition the United States Government so that you can be sent to Iowa where you can learn how to raise hogs.

Eeny, meeny, miny, mo; where did those technicians go?

You will find technicians—good ones—in heavy, war industry.

You will find only an infinitesimal number of technicians in industries and professions which should either serve the consumer or produce consumer goods.

That great Oklahoman, Will Rogers, once said, "All I know is just what I read in the papers."

It is good for us—and it was good for Will Rogers in his time—that Soviet papers have a limited circulation outside of the Iron Curtain.

Knowing this, we can immediately discount heavily their claims of their overwhelming superiority in numbers of trained technicians.

We must realize that the Red Russia-Red China supply of this vital commodity does not necessarily mean experienced trained technicians. Educated people often fail under the stress of practical demands. We have educated people who have succeeded in the face of practical demands. Schooling is important. But, know-how is, also, important. It is hard to come by experience and know-how in countries where private enterprise is nonexistent.

Progress is the result of independent research. Our Edison, our Wright brothers, our De Forrest represent proof of that statement. There is no such thing as independent research in present-day Russia or China. Your Communist scientist does just what he is told to do—no more. If he did more, he would be confronted with the threat of the firing squad.

Mr. Chairman, I do not fear the sudden surge of an output of technicians from Soviet institutions of higher learning. Fear does not enter into this. It might even be that Communist propaganda in this particular field has done us a favor.

American youth learns to drive and service a car only a little after he learns to walk. Hundreds of thousands of American boys have a well-based knowledge of aerodynamics gained from their association with organized model airplane clubs. Four-H Club members have a better understanding of elemental farm problems than some of the 40-year-old students in Soviet agricultural colleges now interested in securing admittance to the United States.

If I need add more, the so-called do-it-yourself fad has swept, is sweeping, this country to such an extent that America is in a fair way to become a nation of trained technicians. Instead of a former political slogan, "a chicken in every pot," we might better say, "a technician in every home."

I say, advisedly, the Soviet propaganda about educated scientists and engineers might eventually help us. It should put us on the alert.

I believe that Americans should do all within their power to open up opportunity for educating more doctors, more physicists, more engineers, more scientists of all kinds, in our institutions of higher learning. We should not put unnecessary obstacles in the path of our young people—the technicians of tomorrow—to deprive them of their manifest destiny. What we should do is to help all talented young people, irrespective of their financial status, to get the education that they deserve. In that way, the call of private enterprise for young technicians can be met. In that way, we can be assured of the inexorable power of the mightiest national defense which has yet been made known to man.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the privilege of serving with the distinguished and able Members from both sides of the aisle who make up this subcommittee;

to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for his many courtesies, and my commendation for his great ability; and to state that I am certain our committee is fortunate indeed in having the services of its very able clerk, Jay Howe.

I shall speak principally on the appropriation for the State Department.

When we consider this request for funds for the State Department, perhaps it will be well also to remind ourselves that it is the only State Department we have. It is the only medium we have for exchange of ideas with other governments. If ever we are to know peace, it logically will be through the agreements which are worked out by the State Department. The State Department is the real Voice of America in our dealings with other nations.

As we consider the importance of the State Department, we must consider also the weaknesses of America's foreign policy in so many instances in the past. Then consider the fact that we now are making very slight progress in terms of reality in achieving the treaties we seek, the international reforms we advocate, and the disarmament we propose. If there are those who would seek to use the nearly approved German treaties as one example for refuting that statement, let me remind you that it has taken many years and many billions of dollars in giveaway programs to bring us part way to that logical achievement.

Perhaps the trouble lies in the fact that we in America have never placed enough emphasis on or importance in the work of the State Department, or adequately delineated its field of endeavor, or given it sufficient backing.

Be that as it may, it still is the only State Department we have. We sink or swim with it. I mean that literally. It is not enough to win wars. We have to win the peace also. For that in modern times we have demonstrated little know-how. Certainly we cannot say we won the peace after World War I or after World War II, or even after Korea. It appears we are now in the process of losing the remainder of Indochina or even the remainder of Southeast Asia. Indonesia hangs in the balance. Its trade is largely with Red China and it is now the host nation to an Afro-Asian conference where the Reds and the so-called neutrals predominate. The coastal islands of China are being given up one by one.

Even in this hemisphere there are misgivings about American leadership. A good many people in uneasy Guatemala, for instance, are wondering whether it really pays to ditch the Communists and line up beside the United States. It is more than 9 months since a revolution led by Col. Carlos Castillo-Armas toppled the government of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, the only pro-Communist regime ever to run an American country. As President, Castillo-Armas soon found that the Communists and fellow travelers had looted the treasury of its last centavo, boosted the Government's debts from \$300,000 to \$38 million and brought the country to the brink of collapse. Fast, generous help from the

United States was counted on, once the pro-Communists were thrown out. Those expectations are not panning out. There is an undercurrent of political uncertainty. Things there are not good. Some people, trying to find a simple reason, put the blame on the United States, complaining that help from Washington has been neither generous nor fast. Certainly Government redtape in Washington is slowing up the aid program. After Guatemalan and American officials in Guatemala finally agree on a project, details have to be gone over in Washington by officials of the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration. That means more delay. Thoughtful people admit that the United States is not to blame for all their troubles. But they are beginning to wonder why the United States—which has handed out billions in Europe and Asia—is not giving more help, with fewer strings attached, to the one country since World War II that has thrown out a pro-Communist government.

Throughout Latin America we allow trade to be lost to American businessmen because we have refused to develop a realistic credit program with which our friends in the Western Hemisphere can purchase supplies and equipment from us. Our European friends and near-friends have developed such a program for Latin America. France and Germany in particular are pouring equipment into those areas after having instituted a very liberal credit program. I scarcely need remind you that money from the United States made it possible for them to extend that easy credit and to take business away from American manufacturers.

Again, good or bad, it is the only State Department we have. It could be better than it is. Possibly more liberal policies by the Congress would encourage a more realistic program by the State Department. That, of course, is getting on dangerous ground. More liberal expenditures can never be a guaranty for a better program. But at least it would present the opportunity and I would be willing to take such a gamble. It is much cheaper than war, even if we count only money and ignore lives.

I am speaking about the appropriation for the State Department, but what I say about it applies very closely to the United States Information Agency. Their work coincides and their objectives are similar. The USIA is an agency designed to tell the world something of America's aims, its ideals, and its policies, and thereby to combat and to offset Russian propaganda. The phenomenal success of Russian propaganda is something we often choose blithely to ignore. Not having been able to compete on equal footing with it, we sometimes are inclined to bury our heads in the sand and happily assume Russia's success is non-existent.

Communism is not a figment of the imagination. Half a century ago few people had ever heard of it and fewer cared whether it existed. Now communism controls twice as many people as are united under the combined banners of America and our allies. Even the so-

called neutrals admit they do not know whether to believe us or the Reds. Talk about the value of propaganda—what stronger argument could you ask?

Here in America, many place altogether too much trust in military security. That type of security, important though it may be, essential though it is, still it is not enough for a nation which refuses to start wars. The other fellow who is free to choose his own weapons and battlegrounds can run circles around us if we rely only on one source of strength. Yet the combined budget for all nonmilitary policy endeavors by this Government—if we eliminate the Marshall plan and similar programs, is infinitesimal compared to military expenditures.

I do not think we can take much pride in the fact that Congress never seriously questions either the number or the cost of bombers. Yet it dissects and tears into little shreds any requests for funds for the State Department or for USIA. A smart opponent who sees us continually leave one flank exposed will certainly take advantage of his opportunity. Russia has built a tremendous empire since World War II—I emphasize the words "since World War II"—without the loss of a single Russian soldier. She did it with diplomacy, deceit, and double-cross, strongly laced with propaganda.

I do not approve of or argue that we should adopt those policies, but I do say most emphatically that bluff, blunder, and bombers are not enough. We ought to know, for these in some instances have marked our own policies.

There are many earnest, sincere, conscientious, capable, and devoted people in the State Department. They are fully aware of the importance of the job that is theirs. They want to do it well. But they are frustrated by policies which change monthly, weekly or even hourly. They are confused by conflicting statements from administration spokesmen. Or, they are tied down by inertia inherited from years of virtual denial of responsibility to them.

Again, and for the last time, it is the only State Department we have. Its people are on our side—not on the side of the enemy. They are Americans, too. Let us be sure that Congress gives them at least the status of an ally. There are ways to make the State Department a stronger vehicle. I doubt there will ever be a greater need for it than now.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree that the recent enactment of the provisions of the Wriston report has been something to strengthen the Foreign Service and has raised the morale of its people?

Mr. SIKES. This committee is implementing the provisions of the Wriston report through funds carried in this bill. I feel, as the gentleman does, that it does strengthen the Foreign Service.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman believe that the enactment of the law by the Congress on the report by the

Foreign Affairs Committee has helped strengthen our foreign relations?

Mr. SIKES. The action of the Congress is indication that such has been our hope and our intention.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman feel with respect to his reference to Southeast Asia that the success of the Secretary of State in working out the SEATO Conference and the development of those areas strengthens our position in the world today?

Mr. SIKES. I cannot agree that it has strengthened us in that part of the world. Certainly I would like to hope that it has. I know that the Secretary of State has given much time and effort to that part of the world but I cannot say that SEATO gives us any real strength; clearly it does not bind anybody to anything. What is going to come out of Southeast Asia nobody knows. The gentleman is aware of the grave and uncertain situation that exists in Indochina today. He knows there are disturbing activities elsewhere in the area. I am seriously concerned about Southeast Asia, and I could not agree to put any other interpretation on it at this time.

Mr. BOW. I think that is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is my recollection of SEATO correct, in substance, that no particular agreements were made; that the only real agreement—and I do not say this in any derogatory sense, because I realize that there are difficulties—but as a fact, in substance, SEATO provides, in case of further Communist aggression against any countries parties to it, that they will consult again?

Mr. SIKES. They will talk some more. SEATO is an effort to accomplish something towards the security of the region, of course, but, as I said a moment ago, it does not bind anybody to anything.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But the committee did turn down flatly the request that the entertainment allowance be changed to foreign operations; is that not correct?

Mr. SIKES. That is scarcely of equal importance with the other matters we are discussing at the moment. Since the gentleman proposes to offer an amendment later on that subject, we will have ample time to discuss it at that time.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York, a few questions about the international education exchange activities. I wonder if you would enlighten us, Mr. Chairman, as to the effect of a cut of \$2 million in a proposed \$22 million program for these activities?

Mr. ROONEY. The cut is not \$2 million but \$10 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. \$10 million out of a \$22 million program?

Mr. ROONEY. I think it will bring us back to some sort of a sane level.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Could the gentleman expand on what a sane level might be? I am a little puzzled about the justification for a cut of that size.

Mr. ROONEY. This is the sort of a program that could be handled for \$1 million, \$5 million, \$20 million, or \$100 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How did you arrive at the figure of \$12 million under those conditions?

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman has read the hearings in regard to this?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Unfortunately, I am not a member of the committee, and I have not had access to them until just a short time ago.

Mr. ROONEY. This request contained a proposal to send 1,300 foreign students from one foreign country to another foreign country. For instance, they would take a young Norseman from Oslo and send him down to Salzburg in Austria to school at the taxpayers' expense. In regard to the gentleman not having access to the hearings, I should like to point out that these hearings have been available to every Member since the 5th of April.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. For the elucidation of those who have not read the hearings, I wonder if you could give us the reasoning behind the justification for the \$10 million cut in a \$22 million program of this kind.

Mr. ROONEY. We found so many things wrong with the program outlined in these hearings that the committee and staff sat down, and one gentleman said, "I think we ought to cut it out completely." Someone else said—and this is all hypothetical—"It should be \$18 million." Someone else said, "Well, maybe it should be so much." And the committee came up with the figure which is now before the House.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does that represent a realistic estimate, in the view of the committee, of what an adequate program represents?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. They should be able to carry on a fine program for the amount of money allowed in this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], referred just now to the scalpel which the Appropriations Committee has used on various items in this bill. In my personal opinion, there is no case where the "scalpel" has been used more clumsily than in the \$10 million cut made in the State Department's request for funds to continue our international educational exchange activities. These activities have inestimable value in demonstrating to the world the advantages of our way of life. They should not be crippled by false economy.

Despite an earnest attempt to discover the reasons for so drastic a cut, I can find

no adequate justification for this action. How does such a cut result in "a sane level" of expenditures? Obviously a cut of this size would have radical effects on a program which by now has proven its effectiveness to virtually all of us. Yet to justify its action, the committee states merely:

With the fiscal situation of the Nation as it is, certain limitations on expenditures for programs which admittedly are of some value but which cannot be classified as "necessary" must be made.

Few of us will argue with the proposition that the Congress should save the taxpayers' money where they can. Certainly we Members of the minority have a good record in this respect. Unnecessary expenditures should be eliminated. But it is quite another thing to argue that the axe should be applied indiscriminately on sound and proven programs. It seems particularly absurd to argue that international educational exchange activities are "unnecessary," and therefore can be eliminated or drastically curtailed. The basic purpose of this program is to acquaint foreign peoples with what we stand for in this country. It has proven its worth. Perhaps the other body, therefore, will recognize the lack of wisdom in this severe cut, and take appropriate action.

As the gentlewoman from Ohio stated previously in her thoughtful presentation, this educational exchange program is too often misunderstood. Perhaps it would not be amiss to mention briefly what other countries are doing in this field, particularly the Soviet Union.

There has been a good deal of talk recently about the increasing importance which the Russians are attaching to so-called cultural exchanges. In 1954, we are told, over 1,000 delegations entered or left the Soviet Union—an increase of nearly 100 percent over the previous year. Sixty percent of the exchanges were with the free nations of Western Europe.

I should like to call your attention to the different ways in which we and the Russians approach this matter of exchange of persons, and what effect these differences have on the people who take part in the exchanges.

The Soviet approach is to invite groups of people, delegations, who can be banded together and herded about to see those things which suit the purposes of the government, and who can be protected from exposure to the less savory aspects of the Communist state. The tours are short-term ones, and rigidly guided. They preclude any opportunity for the visitors to participate in the day-to-day life of the country.

Our own exchange programs provide a direct contrast. Foreign grantees visiting the United States live and carry on their projects in American communities in all parts of the country. There is no need to turn to Washington for permission to go to an unscheduled town or city, unlike visitors to the Soviet Union who often complain about having to go back to Moscow every time they want to change their plans. Our visitors observe American life in all its variety, they exchange ideas with individual

Americans, and draw freely their own conclusions about us, while they engage in professional pursuits of their own choice.

The Russian method has certain superficial attractions. With people who want badly to be convinced, it undoubtedly has had its successes. But it has failed notably with those people who subscribe to the same standards of freedom of inquiry and of objectivity that we do in this country. It has failed with the very people who are most impressed by our adherence to these principles of democracy and freedom and with its embodiment in our methods of conducting an exchange program.

For instance, a European journalist, adhering almost instinctively to the principles which make a free press possible, commented in print on the fact that while her treatment in the U. S. S. R. was lavish and cordial, she was literally too well attended to. In her own words, an "invisible hand" seemed to be directing her every move, and she questioned whether this hand was necessarily that of a guiding angel. She came away uncharmed by the vision of "the people's paradise."

Another journalist, visiting both the United States and Rumania, wrote articles for his home paper about both trips. He saw some of the seamier side of the United States, a Washington slum, but told his readers that he was simply reporting what he had seen and not trying to draw any conclusions about the United States from it. He told them that it should be considered in the context of an America where material well-being was not merely a statistical average between the very rich and the very poor, but something that most citizens participated in. He further presented the slum area in the context of a progressive and unafraid America, facing its problems and working on their solution.

On the contrary, he saw no slums in Rumania. He saw well-stocked stores and attended sumptuous banquets. But when he peered down side-streets where he was not allowed to wander, when he noticed that he was not allowed to talk with people, take the pictures he wanted, or otherwise investigate freely, he concluded, and so informed his readers, that there was want and poverty abroad in the land, and that there was as well, fear and the desire to conceal these flaws.

It seems evident to me that the American way, based on free inquiry and a firm faith in our own institutions, is not only the most sound approach, but the most successful. It is paying the kinds of dividends we want by increasing real understanding and respect for us in foreign countries.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to question the limitation recommended by the committee with reference to the congressional liaison personnel of the United States Information Agency. The proposed reduction in the expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, in which the liaison office is located, from the present level of \$113,000 annually to \$75,000 appears too drastic a cut. If this staff is eliminated, it can only

have the effect of curtailing and reducing the services presently furnished to all Members of Congress.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], I would like to ask a question after a brief preliminary statement.

I am very much interested in the proposed removal of the Bureau of Narcotics from New York to Geneva and am considerably concerned about it. It involves not only the removal of the office, but it means giving up the use of a laboratory belonging to the United States Treasury Department and building a new and probably more expensive laboratory abroad, for at least \$35,000.

When I came on the floor I brought with me an amendment intending to wait until we had reached its place in the reading of the bill and then offer it at line 11 on page 6. I now read it, because it is self-explanatory:

Strike the period and insert a semicolon and then the following: "Provided, That no money in this appropriation shall be spent in connection with any proposal to move the office of the United Nations Bureau of Narcotics from New York City."

In informal discussions on the floor I have come to the conclusion that perhaps there is a general feeling of support of such an amendment; but that we might meet the same situation, without certain technical complications which would be involved, by a colloquy on the floor. This is a part of the United Nations reorganization plan. Much has been made of a reduced expense, if it takes place. No other reason has been given in my hearing.

My question to the gentleman is whether there is a reason, because my observation has been, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that we do not save much by these reorganization plans. We would probably move many of the present personnel to Geneva; we would pay their expenses over there, and on any theory of economy, if we accept that statement, it would be infinitesimal.

The disadvantage is very great. At Geneva we would not have a friendly press such as we have in the United States. We would not have the publicity; we would not have the public opinion reaction that we have in the United States. And I am afraid that the inevitable result would be the gradual stifling of this bureau, of this division of the U. N. as it would then be called, if there were any attempts at investigations that would be inconvenient to the major powers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As the gentleman from California knows, I share his apprehension and concern on this particular transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division from New York to Geneva, Switzerland. I first learned of this possible transfer in December of 1954.

At that time I wrote to Mr. H. J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics for the United States, asking his views on this proposed transfer. I have a letter from him dated December 30, 1954, in which he makes this statement:

We are not in favor of this transfer.

In addition, I contacted our Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., asking him to take into consideration the views of Mr. Anslinger and the views of others who were greatly concerned over this transfer. I have a letter from Ambassador Lodge dated February 8, 1955, in which he says as follows:

The Department of State is responsible for defending the United States' position on this question. I am sending a copy of this letter to the Department. Presumably the question of the transfer will be raised in the Commission in New York in April this year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. May I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the subject?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in full agreement with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in deploring the moving of the headquarters of the U. N. Narcotics Bureau from New York to Geneva.

It is my responsibility to produce the last-minute word from the Department of State concerning this important matter. I am today in receipt of a letter from Assistant Secretary Key of the Department of State which I shall read:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 14, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee for Department of State, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: The Department requested Ambassador Lodge's views on the possibility of an amendment to restrict the use of appropriations for the United States contribution to the United Nations if the U. N. Narcotics Division is moved to Geneva. He replied as follows:

"In reply to your request for my views on the proposed rider withholding the United States contribution to the U. N. if the Narcotics Division is transferred to Geneva, I would say this:

"1. It would be a clear violation of our treaty obligations for us to default on our contribution to the U. N. and, of course, to violate any treaty obligation injures our standing in the world.

"2. Failure to send our contribution would deprive us eventually of the privileges of membership and consequently of influence in the U. N. As the Soviet Union has not defaulted, and presumably will not default once it realizes that we have defaulted, this will mean an enormous increase in Soviet influence.

"3. If we default on our contribution whenever the U. N. Secretariat contemplates some action with which we disagree, then we cannot deny the right of others to do the same thing. This would be a serious blow at the existence of the U. N. and would be against our own long-term interests.

"4. The failure to make our contribution to the U. N. would give a pretext to enemies of the United States to say that we were trying to dictate the international narcotics control program and were using the money power to blackmail the rest of the world.

"5. A member of a legislative body does not withdraw from the legislative body because

it happens to pass a bill with which he disagrees. The U. N. is not a legislative body, and has none of the powers of government, so that there is even less reason for a state to withdraw from the U. N. because of some action with which it disagrees.

"6. I say this as one who has left no stone unturned to present to SYG all arguments against the proposed transfer of this Bureau."

Sincerely yours,

DAVID MCK. KEY,
Assistant Secretary.

In this connection I should like to make part of the RECORD a statement on the United Nations Narcotics Division and a summary statement of facts relating to the transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division to Geneva:

UNITED NATIONS NARCOTICS DIVISION

The Department of State has for some time been concerned with the several aspects of the transfer of the Division of Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations Secretariat from New York to Geneva and is aware of the general interest in this matter. Officers of the Department have discussed the problem many times with Mr. Harry Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, and officials of the Treasury Department. The most recent action taken was to arrange for a discussion of this matter between Mr. Anslinger and the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjöld.

This meeting took place in New York on March 30, 1955. It is our understanding that there was a complete and cordial exchange of views and that the Secretary General, while recognizing the interest of certain groups in the United States in the problem and the matter of affording adequate publicity to meetings of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, did not consider that he could ignore the mandate given him by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly to transfer the Division of Narcotic Drugs to Geneva as part of his overall reorganization plan. The Secretary General pointed out that this action has been approved by unanimous votes in both bodies. The Secretary General did not agree with Mr. Anslinger that the transfer of the Narcotics Secretariat would affect publicity given to the meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs which may well continue to be held in New York. In this connection it may be noted that publicity stems from the meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and not from the Secretariat of the United Nations. The location of meetings of the Commission is a matter for annual determination by the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The Department considers it highly unlikely that all meetings of this Commission will in the future be held in Geneva since there is a great demand by various United Nations bodies to meet in Geneva and there are only limited possibilities for holding meetings there.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF FACTS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF UNITED NATIONS NARCOTICS DIVISION TO GENEVA

Transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division to Geneva has been under discussion for about 2 years. When Mr. Hammarskjöld was appointed Secretary General of the United Nations one of the first tasks he undertook was a scrutiny of the work of the United Nations Secretariat as a whole. To this end he appointed a survey group composed of certain top officers of the United Nations. This group submitted a report which, among other things, recommended the transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva. The report of the survey group stated its conclusion was reached in spite of the disadvantages of locating a part of the Secretariat away from headquarters.

Such disadvantages would tend to be minimized in the case of this largely technical and self-contained Division. On the positive side, such a move would enable closer contact and cooperation to be had with the World Health Organization as well as with the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body all of which are located in Geneva.

Savings would result on such items as travel, New York cost of living adjustment, United States tax reimbursement, possibly home leave commitments and better utilization of the United Nations facilities located at Geneva. It has been estimated that the United Nations would save approximately \$37,000 annually by this transfer.

On the basis of this report, the Secretary General in the summer of 1954 developed a plan for reorganization of the Secretariat including the transfer of the Narcotics Division in the interest of economy and administrative efficiency and submitted the plan to the Economic and Social Council. His proposals were approved by this Council without any specific discussion of the issue of the location of the Narcotics Division.

The Secretary General then submitted his reorganization plan, including the proposed transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva, to the General Assembly where the plan as a whole was approved by a unanimous vote on December 17, 1954. The present situation is, then, that the transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva has been approved by the General Assembly.

There appears to be no question but that the transfer of the Narcotics Division to Geneva will result in economies in the costs of operating the United Nations, a problem which has been of continuing concern to the United States Government. Opinions differ on what effect, if any, the transfer will have on international control of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. As far as publicity is concerned any adverse effects would be minimized if the Commission on Narcotic Drugs were to meet from time to time in New York.

I regret to advise that as far back as the 17th of December 1954 this transfer from New York to Geneva was approved, after having gone through committees and after a unanimous vote in the General Assembly.

The reason is alleged to be that they would save \$37,000 annually by this transfer. It is further claimed that any adverse effects as far as publicity on this country is concerned would be minimized if this Commission on Narcotic Drugs were to meet from time to time in New York.

The distinguished gentlemen understand that I am merely presenting the facts alleged by the State Department.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. I am afraid the saving in money will be offset by a loss in the efficacy of the program.

Mr. ROONEY. The United States share with regard to this matter would come to maybe less than \$10,000. As you know, we discussed this in the full committee yesterday morning.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the United States Information Service appropriation. I am unable to understand how the committee could possibly increase this appropriation by \$3,386,000 in view of the evidence elicited from witnesses before the committee.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], during hearings brought up the question of the Information Service in Spain. It was proposed, I believe, that they increase the number of Information employees to 87. I wonder how many they presently have. I have been unable to determine from the hearings how many they have in Spain. As the gentleman from New York very well pointed out in the hearings, certainly if there is any country in the world that is opposed to communism it is Spain. Why we should be spending money to maintain a big staff of information specialists in Spain I do not understand.

Can the gentleman tell me whether the staff will be increased to 87 if this increased appropriation goes through, or what will be the story in Spain?

Mr. ROONEY. Of course not. That is one of the reasons the committee decreased the amount which was requested. The committee felt that we are entirely too extensively engaged in propaganda in friendly countries where there is no Communist influence, such as Spain, Ireland, and Norway.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many Information employees we have in Spain?

Mr. ROONEY. We have 82 employees, 17 American, and 65 locals.

Mr. GROSS. But all on the backs of the American taxpayers through appropriations by this committee.

Mr. ROONEY. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that this is his Republican administration that came in here and asked for \$88.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am not concerned with what administration it is.

Mr. ROONEY. I would not dismiss that matter as summarily as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] might.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman again that I am not interested whether it is this administration or some other administration. I am interested in trying to balance the budget of this country. Now then taking up the question of Iceland, with a population of 150,000, there are 9 information specialists there plus, as your hearings show, the Armed Forces have 1 delegation of information specialists, an Air Force adviser, and 3 enlisted men and 1 civilian. Then, in addition, to the defense force staff, the United States Air Force maintains an information staff in Iceland, assigned to the Air Force Base, composed of 1 officer, 14 airmen, and 3 civilian employees. Apparently these information specialists are falling over each other throughout the world. Yet, you propose to increase this appropriation by \$3,386,000. I do not understand it.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Iowa should be grateful for our having produced this information for him. It was this committee that asked the questions and you now have a printed record of that information. I could let you in on a few more things such as the extent of English broadcasting and how far superior our Armed Forces Radio Service is to the Voice of America. All these things were taken into consideration when the committee sat in considered judgment on these matters. The gen-

tleman said he did not know the first thing about this bill until yesterday.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his part in cutting these appropriations from the budget requests, but I do not understand how you can add \$3,386,000 to this particular item. In your hearings, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Preston] very well established the fact that despite the millions of dollars we pour out on this information service, he questions Mr. Streibert from the Department of State and elicits from him the response that Britain today is more neutral than ever before.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Streibert is not from the State Department. He is not a diplomat.

Mr. GROSS. If Members of the House will read the hearings beginning on page 41, they find out how little we have accomplished throughout the world with the millions and billions we have spent. In Iceland the Communist Party is the third most powerful party in their parliament. You brought out that information in these hearings and so on down the line as to these foreign countries, and yet here you increase this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York if I may have some additional time?

Mr. COUDERT. We are very much pressed for time now, I would like to say to the gentleman, but I yield 1 more minute to him.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I thought that would be the case when I did not object to a limitation of time, and the next time I will feel constrained to object.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] if when the committee went into this business of the United States contribution to the United Nations whether the committee thought it wise or prudent and in the interest of the American taxpayers to cut our contribution to the United Nations and all its specialized agencies.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee decided it would not be wise to make such a cut.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask him another question. Did you go into the question of the payment of approximately \$180,000 to these 11 characters who were dismissed from the United Nations for alleged disloyalty to the United States? Was that question brought before the committee?

Mr. ROONEY. I thought the gentleman found that in the hearings. We went into that to quite an extent.

Mr. GROSS. I read the hearings to the best of my ability in the short time that I had, but I do not find any evidence that you went into that question as to whether funds appropriated by the Congress were used to pay these 11 characters \$180,000. The gentleman well remembers that a year ago the House passed a resolution with reference to that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman it was indicated by Ambassador Lodge and/or his staff that United States funds were not used for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Did he indicate what funds were used for that purpose?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; and it is in the hearings. The page does not come to my mind right this second, but we did go into this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. This was a special fund to pay tribunal awards present or future, to be financed by the staff assessment scheme—entirely a tax which U. N. employees pay in lieu of national taxes.

Mr. GROSS. So funds contributed by the taxpayers of the United States, by the Congress of the United States to pay the salaries of employees of the United Nations were taxed to put together the \$180,000 that was used to pay these 11 characters. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I advised the gentleman to the contrary just a moment ago.

Mr. GROSS. But no matter how thin you slice it, you cannot have it that way, because we pay money into the United Nations; this Congress appropriates money to the United Nations and if a tax is levied upon the employees of the United Nations, that money comes in part from moneys appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman understand that after an employee gets his money, whatever he does with it is his business. If he contributes to such a fund as this, this is not a Government fund.

Mr. GROSS. May I remind the gentleman that the deductions were compulsory. They are payroll deductions. The employees of the United Nations did not voluntarily hand over any money. They were compulsory payroll deductions. Mr. Lodge calls the payments outrageous, yet went ahead with a tax on the employees, in violation of a resolution passed by this Congress last August saying that no funds appropriated by Congress should be used to pay these people.

Mr. ROONEY. It appears that when this matter of the special fund was before the General Assembly the only people who agreed with the gentleman from Iowa were the Soviets, because the vote was 52 to 5.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows that the American delegates opposed this payment. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] opposed it, and you will find his statements in the handbook issued by the United Nations General Assembly and made available to the last session of Congress. I have it here in the Chamber and will read it to the gentleman later if he is not convinced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I am particularly interested in the operation of the radio station in West Berlin, RIAS. I looked through the hearings, and the only listing I find that was elicited after considerable difficulty by the chairman was that they were again asking for \$2,500,000 for the year ending 1956. I would like to ask the chairman if that is being cut by the committee or is that full amount being given?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that it is not being cut. The request was in the amount of two and a half million. This committee is acquainted with the fact that this has been one of the successful operations over all the years. We have never heard a bit of criticism of the operation of that station. The facts with regard thereto may be found beginning at page 141 of the hearings, and continued on page 142, where there is a breakdown of the total estimated cost.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have that before me. I thank the gentleman.

I also notice that the gentleman from New York said, "This is a very peculiar way to present a budget." I also agree that it is a good operation, but I think it could be cut without doing any great harm. The gentleman knows that the great fame of the station RIAS is that it operates 24 hours a day. I do not think that is necessary, in view of the fact that 54 percent of that time is taken up by musical programs. Taking music to the Germans or behind the Iron Curtain is like taking coals to Newcastle. Quite frankly, although it may be discouraging to hear it, the average German or Slav looks upon American music as an amusing aberration of American aborigines—nothing more nor less. Therefore, I think some of this could be cut down without doing the program the slightest harm.

After seeing the operation of RIAS I went on my own time to London to check over the BBC programs. They assured me in their usual courteous fashion but with tongue in cheek that, of course, they did not have anything like our money and, therefore, could not even attempt to carry out a program 24 hours a day, but they felt they were doing just as much good and possibly more, because owing to our 24-hour program we got the benefit of all the jamming. I just wanted to call that to the attention of the committee especially as the committee has made severe cuts—in fact I am very distressed to see the cuts they have made regarding the book *The Profile of America*. I think funds for this book should be very liberal.

Mr. ROONEY. That matter was quite fully discussed. I have read it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have read it too and purchased many copies of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman approve our spending \$225,000 to put this book out all over the world as an example of American art and culture?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes; I may say that I do. I think it is a very fine example.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman taken this up with any member of the subcommittee on either side of the aisle?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to further say to the gentleman from New York that the testimony before the committee and the committee's reading of the matters found in the book were of such convincing interest to him, that the Director of the Agency, Mr. Streibert, withdrew the request after the committee had already acted.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentleman that does not appear in his report.

Mr. ROONEY. No, I believe all this does not appear in the report, but I believe the report does state that we cut out the money.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That you did. I was just pointing that out.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have but 1 minute to talk about the United States Information Agency. I think this is a very important and worthwhile agency.

As far as I know, I am the only public-relations and advertising man in the House of Representatives, and I have a professional interest in this agency. I have studied its activities. I know the background, not only of the Director, Mr. Streibert, but of the men he has surrounded himself with since the agency has been reorganized. He is doing a fine job. I am extremely distressed to find its funds cut so drastically and to see the curtailment of the activities of this agency.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I have not time to yield.

Mr. BOW. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman tell us where we have curtailed any of the present activities of this agency?

Mr. WILSON of California. You have curtailed the funds \$8 million under what the President asked for.

Mr. BOW. We have actually increased the appropriation.

Mr. WILSON of California. Over what we spent last year.

Mr. BOW. We have given them more than \$3 million over what they had for this year, so there is no curtailment.

Mr. WILSON of California. But you have cut down what the President recommended.

Mr. BOW. Yes; we cut it down somewhat, but we have not curtailed the

activities of the Agency; in fact we have given them money to increase their activities.

Mr. WILSON of California. It will seriously curtail them. The President knew what he was doing when he asked for the increased appropriation. It is ironic that we should spend so much on armed might—I am a member of the Armed Services Committee, and we must spend \$29 billion a year to protect our ideals. It does seem strange that we cannot sell our own system through propaganda effort constructively administered by the United States Information Agency. The United States Information Agency has functioned in an outstanding way. It needs encouragement in the form of additional funds.

Of all the new improvements brought into the Agency by Mr. Striebert and his associates, the most effective, in my opinion, has been the worldwide coverage of the President's atoms-for-peace plan. This proposal, properly publicized by the USIA, has electrified the free world. I have no doubt that today the wire services are carrying the story of President Eisenhower's offer of the Salk vaccine to the world as evidence of our own peaceful intentions.

Some 16 months ago President Eisenhower, speaking before the General Assembly of the United Nations, startled the world with a tremendous proposal for a cooperative international effort to put the atomic energy to work for the benefit, not the destruction, of mankind.

With this proposal, the President said, the United States pledged its heart and mind "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life."

It then became the responsibility of the United States Information Agency to acquaint the world with the United States proposal. For, as the President said upon another occasion:

It is not enough for us—

The United States—

to have sound policies, dedicated to goals of universal peace, freedom and progress. These policies must be made known to and understood by all peoples throughout the world.

Even before the President had left the United Nations rostrum, the Voice of America was broadcasting his speech. Later that day, in the Voice's regular foreign language programs, the speech, translated into as many as 38 languages, was rebroadcast. It was taken apart and sections were beamed to specific areas. Editorial comment in this country, comments by Government officials, Members of Congress, leaders of professional and civic groups, were included in these programs.

The Wireless File, a 7,000-word daily news summary of the Agency's press and publications division, was transmitting the text of the speech while the President was speaking. Overseas posts translated the text into the language of the countries in which they were located and distributed it to newspapers and magazines. Follow-up material, reprints from United States publications, edito-

rial roundups, leaflets, pamphlets, were supplied to all 210 posts of the United States Information Agency.

The 157 information centers of the Agency and the 35 binational centers stocked their library shelves with publications on the subject. Previously, the Agency itself had prepared a simple pamphlet or booklet and this was made widely available.

The educational exchange program of the State Department sent scientists and other specialists in the field abroad to lecture under the auspices of United States Information Agency centers.

The motion picture division of the Agency prepared a series of short, documentary films, dealing with adaptation of the atom to industry, and medicine. It purchased similar films from private producers. All were sent overseas for distribution through normal commercial channels or to be shown to key groups.

In key overseas cities the Agency staged atoms-for-peace exhibits that were seen and are being seen by millions. The Rome, Italy, show clocked its millionth visitor before it went on tour. A West Berlin show drew crowds, not only from the West Zone of Germany but from the Soviet area as well. In São Paulo, Brazil, the city asked for and received permanent possession of the exhibit which was shown by the United States Information Agency in connection with the city's 400th anniversary celebration. In the first 3 weeks the exhibit in Karachi drew 350,000 visitors before taking to the road. All exhibits are sent on tour after the initial showing. The Indian exhibit in the next 2 years plans to visit 50 cities and universities. Dr. K. S. Krishnan, a member of India's Atomic Energy Commission, sponsored the opening in New Delhi March 10.

Each development of the proposal has been given equally thorough coverage. As I said, this is a continuing project, and the United States Information Agency proposes to make the most of it. All peoples throughout the world will hear of the hope-bringing program proposed by the United States.

The Communists at first tried to ignore the President's proposal. As interest mounted, however, they changed their tactics and concentrated on that part of the President's speech in which he had warned of the horrors of atomic war. This, they said, was atom rattling. It was warmongering, and so forth. Simultaneously, they increased their ownphony peace campaign.

When this failed to get the reaction that suited them, they announced that the U. S. S. R. was sharing its atomic secrets with the satellites. Ignoring the United States proposal, they claimed credit for originating the atoms-for-peace idea. They made fantastic claims about what they had done and planned to do.

Communist propaganda attacked the United States atoms-for-peace program as evil, monopolistic, and a cloak for warmongering.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the peace-loving peoples of the world are being fooled by these efforts of the Communists. No proposal of the United

States has ever met with such favorable world reaction.

And, let me add, it is indeed the atoms-for-peace proposal that is so gaining friends for the United States. The United States Information Agency is not, and cannot be, any more effective than United States policies. Deeds will always be more important than words. But deeds can be and, in this case, are properly interpreted. Above all, it is, as President Eisenhower has said, not enough for us to have constructive policies. Those policies must be made known to and understood by all peoples throughout the world. There would be a need to tell our story even if we were not confronted by this Communist anti-U. S. A. campaign. That campaign only lends urgency to our efforts.

The effort is being made. It must be supported by anything and everything this country can do to back it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in respect to appropriations for the USIA and in particular to the appropriation for the Office of Private Cooperation. It is my understanding that a request was submitted for \$270,000. The committee saw fit to reduce this to \$170,000, which is about \$4,000 less than was appropriated for the operations of this important unit this year.

I feel that the Office of Private Cooperation is doing an excellent job in enlisting the services of private, commercial and noncommercial organizations and that the expenditures for this unit are magnified many fold in its effects on our overseas program. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from New York will enlighten the Members on the reasons why it was necessary to cut the request for this agency.

Mr. ROONEY. We agree with the gentleman to some small extent, but the committee did not go to such an extent as to allow \$34,000 for the launching and development of new community and institutional projects, such as symphony salutes and community participation programs. We thought that was so delightful that we might very well pass it up in the interest of trying to help the President balance the budget.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, when a committee reports an appropriation bill with certain reductions from the budget request such as is the case with H. R. 5502 making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1956, I experience a feeling of sympathy for committee members. I know members do not enjoy cutting department requests.

Nevertheless, in spite of any such sympathy, I must express a far deeper regret, a much stronger emotion of disappointment, that in the case of the educational exchange program of the State Department the committee has seen fit to slash

\$10 million from the President's request, cutting it to \$12 million, which is \$3 million below last year.

Let me confess to some misgivings as to our foreign-aid program, but at the same time let me say that I have no reservations, in fact nothing but the highest regard, for the effectiveness and value of educational and student exchange programs.

It has been apparent for a long time, it seems to me, that our weakness in the foreign relations field has been that as a nation we have had to deal with other governments, many of which, particularly in the Far East, have been governments which had little communication with or were far removed from the peoples of their respective countries. Meanwhile the Communists were dealing both on the government level and also on the level of the people. After the Communists enslave the people of a nation it may be different, but when they woo them and soften them up they concentrate on the masses.

On this account I have long favored the exchange of persons program as a powerful instrument in communicating and interpreting our American philosophy and way of life.

This cut to \$12 million, as I understand it, would eliminate about everything in the program, with the exception of the Fulbright scholarships. In other words, \$8 million is earmarked for foreign currency payments, which will require supplementation with 2 or 3 millions in American dollars, thus leaving approximately 1 to 2 millions for administration.

Meanwhile while we have been reducing our program with the countries of Western Europe and other nations in other parts of the world potentially friendly, there has been an intensification of Communist effort to win these peoples away from us. I have read that exchanges conducted by the Soviet Union in 1953 and 1954 indicated there was a doubling of known exchange delegations to and from the Soviet Union in the latter year, and that 61 percent of these efforts were concentrated in Western Europe.

United States expenditures in economic and military assistance has failed and indeed were never designed to explain our policies and combat elements hostile to or ignorant of the United States. Actually we were in the position of stimulating other nations' national pride, which in turn created reluctance to acknowledge our leadership and false ideas about what America is and stands for.

To me, the education exchange program combated these irritations and misunderstandings. It conveyed directly to other people, through personal experience, the truth about us, and that is something an ambassador or any high Government official cannot effectively accomplish.

Because of my personal interest in educational exchanges with friendly countries, I obtained from Mr. Russell Riley, who is in charge of this State Department program, some typical ex-

amples of individual foreign reactions to America. I think these speak for themselves.

For example, a Norwegian Member of Parliament writes that he was "highly gratified to observe in the American people a deep interest in the other members of NATO and a sincere desire to cooperate with and to help these member countries to maintain peace and their freedom. Further, the United States appears always to stand ready to help all countries in need and deserving of help, in order to further peace in the world."

An Irish newsman commented on the contribution which exchanges make to "the raising of journalistic standards internationally, the stimulation of news and information as between the United States and other countries, and, generally, to the removal of prejudices, based on ignorance, which can persist between the Old World and the new."

A British physicist noted that his countrymen "generally picture Americans as being self-confident, invariably wealthy, easy going, and concerned only with the material aspects of life. No doubt I shared this picture—to some extent at least—before I had the opportunity to visit the United States. There I had the opportunity to see the American people in their homes, in their churches, at work and at play. I had not been in the United States of America very long before I found my previous ideas about America to be wrong in many respects."

Our cultural life is often a surprise to Western Europeans. A French teacher said that she realized after her stay in this country that "the people of the United States of America are far more highly cultured than I expected. The impression remains with me that the United States of America is a success, the inheritor and continuer of the best European traditional culture, plus an absence of narrowmindedness too often found in European highbrows."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say I shall not offer an amendment to restore what I believe to be the necessary funds to carry on an adequate exchange program. This is because it would seem better procedure to hope that a more liberal understanding as to the value of the program will be taken by the Senate.

In this connection I do express the hope that if such is the case and the matter comes to conference, the House conferees will adopt a more generous attitude, because in my opinion the exchange of persons between friendly nations is one program that has really been effective in our effort to maintain the political alignments with free nations that are fundamental to our foreign policy.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dixon].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I arise to protest the reduction in the appropriation to International Educational Exchange Activities from the President's request of \$22 million to \$12 million as recommended in H. R. 5502. This is a drastic reduction from even the present operating level of approximately \$18½

million, and entirely unwarranted in my opinion, as I shall point out.

Secretary of State Dulles says in his 13th semiannual report under date of March 15, 1955:

A true and lasting partnership between the United States and other nations of the free world requires that we better understand each other's positions, needs, and hopes. Economic, political, and even military cooperation depends upon more than superficial understanding of each other's countries and ways of life. The significance of the exchange program to our foreign relations is that it opens the way for the people of the United States and other countries to know each other better through person-to-person contact and through exchanging projects of mutual interest and value, this understanding develops.

Immediately prior to entering Congress this January, I was president of the Utah State Agricultural College, a land-grant college which has enrolled more than a hundred of these foreign students, supported in part, or in whole by the International Educational Exchange budget. This college is also under contract with the United States Government to employ and supervise a minimum of 42 agricultural, public health, and other technicians in foreign countries.

Also, up until last December I was chairman of the Utah State Fulbright committee which selected the Americans who were to represent the State of Utah abroad on the Fulbright scholarship program.

These positions enable me to speak to some extent from first-hand experience on the problem of educational exchange activities and the need for funds to promote these activities.

Let me relate one experience alone to show you why I disagree with the committee in its statement that these exchange activities cannot be classified as unnecessary Government expenditures.

Some years ago a lad named Zahadi was sent here by the Iranian Government through the aid of our international exchange program. He registered at the Utah State Agricultural College in the Department of Agriculture, and after 5 years study obtained a degree. This lad's father is now the Prime Minister of Iran, and our people who know say that he, his father, and his uncle, who also attended Utah State Agricultural College, were tremendously important factors in preventing Iran from going Communist.

Furthermore, those in charge of the affairs in Iran have testified to me that one of our agricultural agents in the field of Iran is greater protection to all liberty-loving countries than a battleship in the harbor.

Is peace unnecessary? Exactly what is peace in the world worth? Of what use is all of our wealth, our great institutions and prosperity, if anything happens to our country? Is peace an expenditure or is investment in peace an expenditure?

I am here to say that an investment in this program is one of the best investments that America can make and that we cannot consider it an unnecessary expenditure.

The President has requested an increase of about 20 percent for this program—from \$18½ million to \$22 million. This modest increase was planned to be used for approximately a 50-percent increase in the program with our Latin-American neighbors to the south of us, an area long overlooked in our international relations. Part of the increase was planned to be used for a 50-percent increase in the program with the critical Asian countries. The amount recommended by our distinguished committee would eliminate these increases. Actually they will make drastic cuts in the program with these areas. These areas will represent the future balance of power within the free world.

I cannot see the wisdom of these penny-wise, pound-foolish cuts. I feel that this program, which is being operated by our State Department with the devoted cooperation of thousands of private citizens both here and abroad who serve the program without remuneration in a sincere effort to maintain peace in the free world will do more than anything that I can imagine to stop the surge of aggressive communism.

Members of our faculty who have studied in foreign countries under the Government's exchange program have returned with a changed attitude toward foreign countries and with a missionary zeal for making our foreign exchange students at the college feel at home, and with an understanding of the needs of these foreign students that is invaluable to the college.

In fact, these are men that we have placed in charge of the guidance program for foreign students in the institution. These are the men whom we assign to conduct the tours of foreign leaders brought here under the State Department's program to see our research and our extension activities. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that I might also add this thought that as our professors from our great institution in Utah work in these foreign countries their activities are not only limited to the classroom but they are extremely active in community activities. They deal with the local population in a grass-roots way that our diplomatic corps can never reach.

These men upon returning have felt the inspiration that comes through serving people who are dependent upon them. They have such a missionary zeal and see such great opportunity to direct the thinking of the people of the world toward our democratic way of life, that in spite of the sacrifices and hazards to which they were subjected overseas, more than the majority of them want to turn right around and go back. I wish they were here to testify to you now upon this appropriation which has been classified as unnecessary.

I object to the inference that inasmuch as there are 2,656 students as participants in this exchange program that it is unnecessary. In addition to these, we have 3,500 more leaders from foreign countries, as well as advanced research specialists who perform research who go back home to transform the living conditions in their home countries, to say nothing of the exchange teachers—

school teachers which we bring to this country and the American teachers whom we sent to foreign countries. Certainly no one in any country has the lasting influence upon the youth of a nation equal to that of a school teacher.

I want to certify that these people are walking into the hearts of common people in foreign countries as no tourist, diplomat, or Federal employee can do.

May I call your attention further to the fact that \$8 million of the \$12 million set up in the bill does not represent a cash expenditure from our budget; it represents lend-lease funds which foreign countries owe us and which are used for the purpose of operating the program. So actually the bill calls for a cash budget expenditure of only \$4 million, which I contend should be increased by the \$10 million amount requested by the President.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, knowing that we would have under consideration today the budget request of the United States Information Agency, I felt this would be a most appropriate time to raise some fundamental questions concerning that program.

Unfortunately, the only real opportunity we have to examine this program is when it comes up for an appropriation.

Unlike other major programs of the Government, USIA does not benefit from a standing committee of the House being directly and continuously concerned with its efforts to serve the public interests.

Mr. Chairman, for some years I have maintained an interest in the work of our information services in various parts of the world. My work on both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, afforded me the opportunity to observe first hand the manner and scope on which these programs are carried out in many countries. I have one basic criticism to make—which is in no way a reflection on the Appropriations Committee or the United States Information Agency. That criticism is that we have failed to fully understand the tremendous power for good inherent in such programs and the relationship they have to the urgent question of peace or war. Consequently, we have put forth a mediocre effort in the development of a world-wide information program geared to the demands of our time.

It is true we have made some progress and there are signs that the American people are becoming increasingly aware of the need for a full-scale information program. President Truman gave the program a great lift in 1950 when he called for a crusade of truth to offset the conspiracy of communism and to prevent further Russian aggression. Then in 1953, we advanced another step when the United States Information Agency was established as a separate agency of Government under an arrangement calling for the close coordination with the Department of State.

In between times the program has suffered setbacks caused by a wide variety of influences, not the least of which has been lethargy and lack of understanding concerning the crisis which now grips the entire world. Ignorance has been and remains the greatest enemy of freedom and individual liberty. Emotionalism and prejudice are still the children of ignorance.

Most of us at one time or another have characterized the struggle with the Kremlin as a fight for the hearts, the minds, and the allegiance of all the people of the world. Few among us would disagree on the accuracy of this description. Yet, what have we really done to harness the great scientific discoveries in the field of communications to this struggle for the hearts, the minds, and the allegiance of mankind. My judgment is that we have done very little—both by the measurement of comparison to what the enemy has done and is continuing to do in this field and against the possibilities which are ours for the using.

It is reliably estimated that the Russians spend somewhere between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion a year on their propaganda program. That program, of course, uses the big lie, the platinum promise, and the Utopian dreams as tools to confuse, to divide, to drug, and to enslave mankind. The Russians maintain extensive experimental facilities and institutes for the scientific research into the use of information media as a tool of the Communist conspiracy. Moreover, they maintain ideological centers such as the Lenin Institute where strategic campaigns are carefully worked out involving a massive propaganda output. They coin words and phrases calculated to put freemen to sleep and to further terrorize those under their cruel rule. We must recognize that they make maximum use of all information media—for evil and ugly purposes. While they lack truth and revolt the natural law, they possess great skill and experience in applying the propaganda weapons.

It did not take us long to recognize the need to harness nuclear energy for purposes of peace and, if needs be, war. We wisely established a joint committee of the Congress on atomic energy in order to make sure that this great power for good or for evil would be kept in the hands of the American people. The benefits we have derived for ourselves and for all mankind as a consequence of these actions are manifold.

It, therefore, seems strange that we have, up to the present, failed to see clearly the great power inherent in our information programs and then to harness them to our goal of peace, freedom and prosperity for all mankind. We must realize that an informed people are a people who will not be enslaved, that our strongest and most determined allies are the vast majority of the people enslaved within the Red colonial empire. When we understand that our information programs have a major bearing on the will to fight of the Armed Forces under the command of the Kremlin we are urged to push forward to their full development. If we are going to win and hold the friendship of the nations of peo-

ple of the world we must make known to them what our ideals and aspirations are. In so doing we will soon convince them that their own ideals and aspirations are very similar. That type of partnership can be established only by the transmission and exchange of ideas between the people of other lands and the American people. The information programs carried on by USIA are directed at attaining that objective.

What is needed to put our international information programs on a level and scope commensurate with their importance is a joint committee of Congress on international information programs.

The Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, on which I had the privilege of serving, made a very careful and thorough study of the international criminal conspiracy of communism. After study of the methods and techniques of the conspiracy on a worldwide basis it concluded that the work of the USIA was worthy of support because it was effective in the fight against communism. It reaches the people behind the Iron Curtain with the truth concerning the policies and actions of the free world, a service we must increase if we are to keep up the spirits of the enslaved people and offset the constant pounding of Russian false propaganda concerning our hopes and strivings for peace with freedom and justice. It does a good job in unmasking the lies, distortions and treachery of the Communist conspiratorial operation in the free world so that free people may know the signs of the scourge and thereby take proper action to eliminate it.

The select committee recommended that Congress give the USIA full support not only by way of an increase in funds but also by strengthening its role in our Government's political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. The most practical way of strengthening the role of USIA in our political offensive for the cause of peace with freedom is by establishing a joint committee of the Congress on international information programs. I would ask you to consider these reasons as basic justification for such a joint committee:

First. Ideals and their transmission to the multitudes of people throughout the world form a weapon in the struggle between the forces of human freedom and those of Russian slavery which may, in the end, be more powerful than nuclear energy.

Second. The great ideals which have stirred and inspired mankind for many centuries form the basis of a real American foreign policy. We must learn to better communicate our ideals to all the people of the world.

Third. We possess all the scientific means to transmit our ideals to the world, some of which we have not as yet put to use. We must develop the capacity to use these scientific advances to the fullest.

Fourth. The American people will solidly support a widely expanded and intelligently directed international information program because they know that the question of peace or war could very

well be resolved in our favor by such an expanded program.

Fifth. There has been an understandable hesitancy in bringing about a full-scale crusade of truth through the information programs but the time for hesitation has long passed. Full scale political action in behalf of freedom's cause is now self-evident.

Sixth. The Members of Congress being closest to the American people are in the best position to provide the impetus for an international information program commensurate with our capacities and the demands of the world crisis which now requires us to expand billions and billions of dollars each year for necessary defense preparations. It is up to Congress to lift this program of USIA up by its bootstraps and to place it on a level of government in keeping with its inherent potential.

Seventh. The ingenuity of the free press of the United States is everywhere recorded in the records of our struggles for individual liberty and a decent life. A dynamic on the American scene which has not been fully tested in the struggle for the minds, the hearts, and the allegiance of all mankind.

These are some of the basic reasons which best argue the need for a greatly expanded information program, which urge us to give consideration to the need for a joint committee of Congress as one way of assuring the American people that we are using all our weapons for peace with freedom to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to become involved in the debate of personalities which threaten to impede the proper functioning of the Refugee Relief Act. Anyone among us who, in the name of friendship, seeks to exploit for his own political gain those men and women hoping for refuge in this land does a disservice to the humanitarian principles upon which the legislation was inspired. It is apparent that not only in this, but other problems, that we try politically to exaggerate differences that do not really exist. When we do this, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that we only play into the hands of evil forces which seek to exploit differences to the advantage of those who will charge this Nation with hypocrisy rather than the truth regarding our desire to help the unfortunate throughout the world.

I have heard and read many reckless statements in the last few days by some who profess to be friends of those who would seek the privilege of coming to our shores.

Mr. Chairman, the political implication may be understood in this country, but what will the meaning be to those who live in the free nations of the world?

This Congress and this administration believe in the principles of the Refugee Relief Act, and I hope serious consideration will be given to words before spoken, not only to their political implication but also the impact of those words upon the people we seek to help.

I would like today to speak about the progress being made toward the objectives of the Refugee Relief Act—that humanitarian legislation so firmly supported by President Eisenhower.

I was delighted to note that our Secretary of State, in his press conference Monday, paid tribute to the Administrator of that act, Scott McLeod. "Nothing," he said, "has come to my attention which in any way shakes my respect for or loyalty to Mr. McLeod."

In view of this consistent leadership of the refugee relief program, it is fitting that, as the half-way mark in this 40-month program is reached, we examine its accomplishments and consider the ways in which the American people must help during the next 20 months, to bring this program to a successful conclusion.

Mr. McLeod found himself—by specific provision of the Refugee Relief Act—the Administrator of this emergency law when it was enacted in August of 1953. From a standing start, his office tooled up a worldwide visa-issuing machine and were in business within a few months.

The Refugee Act involved international agreements, interagency understandings, financing problems, overseas installations, creation of regulations, hiring of workers in this country and in foreign cities, plans for security investigations, medical examinations, processing cases and myriad other details of a vast new system that was required to reach around the world on short notice. Is it any wonder that there have been expressions of impatience from those who thoughtlessly felt that some magic wand should be waved and refugees moved within days and weeks? The interests of the United States are expressed in the law of Congress on this matter and must be protected above all else.

No one person could be brought into this country until an American citizen acted to become his sponsor. That is the law. An American citizen must furnish an assurance of a job and housing for every principal applicant under this act. There must be assurances further that the newcomer will not become a public charge, and the job he takes will not displace an American worker. This was not a group movement project, as in the previous Displaced Persons Act, where boatloads of persons were brought to our shores and the newcomers distributed to jobs after they arrived.

Under the Refugee Relief Act no person leaves the other country for the United States until he has an American citizen sponsor and a job, housing, and a friendly assurance that he will not become a burden to his new community. Today, this refugee program, which calls for the entry of 209,000 persons during the life of the act, has 107,523 in its pipeline, and the program is just reaching its halfway mark. This pipeline figure is the cumulative total of all applicants who have been notified of the documents required to speed their cases to completion. Of the more than 30,000 cases that have so far been processed, approximately 25,000 visas have been issued to date. More than 30 percent of these visas have been issued in the last few

months. In addition, more than 75,000 applications are in some stage of processing, an increase of more than 30,000 within 2 months.

This stepped-up tempo of the program sustains the confidence of the Administrator that with present and planned staffing, financing, and organization, there can be issued—within the time limit—sufficient visas for all who can qualify under the act and for whom there are required assurances.

A major limiting factor in this important program is the attitude of American citizens themselves. They can provide or withhold the needed assurances. Many of them are contributing liberally to finance the church, fraternal, and national group voluntary agencies that are recognized by the Department of State for cooperation in the program. Are the staffs of all these voluntary agencies extending every effort for constructive assistance to their Government? Or, do some yield to a temptation to criticize, yet avoid a self-analysis that might reveal their own shortsightedness?

Persons and groups who profess a deep concern for the plight of the refugee have a heavy responsibility for public sentiment on this subject. By their own spirit and optimism they can influence the giving of assurances. Or, by giving way to criticism of the program, they can make the way harder for themselves, for their Government, and for the refugee.

I am pleased to point out the voluntary agencies' optimism with respect to their ability to produce a greater number of assurances, as well as the increasing number of assurances received from individual American sponsors, indicating a tremendous increase in the workload in the 1956 fiscal year. It is interesting, I am sure, to many Members to consider the assurances received by the Administrator of this act up until April 1, 1955.

A breakdown by agency of the 16,858 verified assurances is as follows:

Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc.	22
American aid for expellees and immigration	7
The American Branch of the International Social Service, Inc.	15
American Committee for Resettlement of Polish DP's	140
American Federation of International Institutes, Inc.	435
The American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc.	100
American Latvian Association in the United States, Inc.	2
American National Committee To Aid Homeless Armenians	12
Baptist World Alliance Relief Committee, displaced persons resettlement program	162
Calvinist Resettlement Service of the Christian Reformed Church	6
Catholic Committee for Refugees	50
Chinese-American Civic Council	8
Church World Service	3, 043
Federation of Russian Charitable Organizations of the United States	1
Greek American Progressive Association	39
International Rescue Committee, Inc.	229
National Lutheran Council	2, 496
Order of AHEPA, Refugee Relief Committee	503

Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.	666
United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit	16
United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc.	182
United HIAS Service	756
United Ukrainian American Relief Committee	755
War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference	7, 141
Miscellaneous agencies	72
Total	16, 858

President Eisenhower has elicited from a high proportion of the 48 States a firm response to his suggestion for governor's advisory committee for the refugee relief program. These committees are kept in close touch with the program and are watchful for ways in which their States can benefit from it. These citizen groups go out and get job assurances. They place potential sponsors in touch with voluntary agencies in position to endorse sponsorships and to attend to details of cases. They are key factors throughout the country in informing the public that sponsors of refugees are the big need to bring this program to full success. They need the cooperation of citizens, if this humanitarian legislation really does mean that the heart of America—in the tradition of old—reaches out to those oppressed in other lands.

I bespeak for the refugee relief program around the world the confidence and support of American citizens, whose job, housing, and support assurances must be on record before the refugee program can move a refugee.

To those who would know the real nature of Mr. McLeod's assignment, I would point out that as administrator of the Refugee Relief Act his job, and the job of his staff, is that of assisting intelligent, hard-working, healthy aliens, who are free of criminal and subversive taint, to migrate to this country. All of us interested in the program, as citizens and taxpayers, have the common duty to make certain that the best interests of the United States are safeguarded. This is particularly the case with the Refugee Relief Act, since it contains basic provisions not subject to broad interpretation. There are areas of discretion, however, in both the law and the regulations, when application of good judgment is not only possible but essential if the program is to succeed.

This is the spirit of the program and of its administrator and his staff. But the final accomplishment of the refugee program lies not with an administrator, it lies with American citizens themselves. Their individual sponsorships of applicants are the key to success.

Refugee relief program—Status of visa applications Apr. 8, 1955

	Italy	Greece	Netherlands	Germany	Austria	Far East	Others	Total
1. Applicants notified of documents required	58, 785	16, 658	1, 061	16, 820	8, 701	2, 115	3, 383	107, 523
2. Visas issued	16, 398	4, 130	468	1, 138	1, 911	497	268	24, 810
3. Visas refused	1, 349	639	22	1, 580	804	537	197	5, 128
4. Canceled action	536	66	86	697	373	51	189	1, 998
5. Applications still in process	40, 502	11, 823	485	13, 405	5, 613	1, 030	2, 729	75, 587
6. Assurances received by Administrator	5, 076	8, 224	244	10, 465	3, 968	2, 440	3, 191	33, 608
7. Assurances verified and sent to field	4, 169	7, 182	124	9, 147	3, 655	1, 989	2, 428	28, 694
"Pipeline"								107, 523
Visas processed								—31, 936
Applications in process								75, 587

NOTE.—All figures cumulative. Items 6 and 7 reflect principal aliens only.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, under the State Department appropriation, funds are made available for the International Joint Commission, an agency whose work is taking on greatly increased importance as a result of the power and seaway development on the St. Lawrence River.

Under the terms of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, which the International Joint Commission was created to implement, the Governments of the United States and Canada are authorized to enter into joint development of the water resources along the United States-Canadian border. They are also required to provide protection and compensation for damages which may result from such developments.

Heretofore, water resources developments along the border have been such that the Commission required relatively modest appropriations; and except for the chairman, the services of part-

time commissioners, drawn from other agencies, have sufficed. Now, however, we are entering into an era when the hydroelectric power of the St. Lawrence River is about to be harnessed, and a great new inland waterway is about to be opened up to deep water shipping. The effect of these developments on shore property along the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario may be profound; and unless the Commission faithfully and diligently discharges its duty to provide protection and indemnity to injured parties, the effect may be disastrous.

While I expect to vote for the bill before us, including the modest sum allocated to the International Joint Commission, I wish to suggest to the House that the impending developments on the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario may portend and require significant expansion of the activities and responsibilities of the Commission in the near future, if the rights of United States citizens, guaranteed to them under the Constitution and under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, are to be protected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, for some time I have been very much concerned about the lack of comprehensive research and intelligence material dealing with Communist propaganda emanating from every quarter of the world. During the 2-year period in which I was connected with Radio Free Europe the fundamental importance of this information was demonstrated again and again. The most subtle shifts in Soviet policy can often be recognized by thorough and exhaustive analysis of the direction or emphasis of the propaganda emanating from a particular Communist-controlled nation.

For that reason, I direct attention to the fact that the budget for the Office of Research and Intelligence contained in the committee report is \$173,000 short of the budget estimate of the United States Information Agency. The Office of Research and Intelligence was created as a result of a survey done by Mr. Allen Dulles and has provided a unique service which has long been overdue. This is the first time that the United States Government has had an organization specifically charged with following the vast and complicated activities of Soviet propaganda.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned with the cut in the international educational exchange program funds. I subscribe to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Utah. I think it is very unfortunate that the committee has characterized these funds as not necessary.

With all respect to the committee, I feel that they have put a foolish dollar sign on international understanding. The benefits from this magnificent program simply cannot be measured in terms of dollars.

I like the educational exchange program just as I like point 4 and as I like SUNFED and the other programs which help to sell the ideologies which we have to the remaining free peoples of the world. I consider it somewhat tragic that this expenditure has been cut down so much.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the bill now before us, under the able chairmanship of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], has done its usual fine job in the preparation and presentation of this bill. What I have to say at this moment is only indirectly related to the bill, and must not in any way be considered as a criticism of the committee or any of its members. I appreciate that if the matter I am about to refer to were to be dealt with by legislation it should be presented to the ap-

propriate legislative committee and not dealt with as part of an appropriation bill.

I am referring to the Corsi-Dulles controversy, a wholly Republican controversy, within the Republican State Department, which, however, reflects badly upon our Government regardless of its political complexion.

While I am not personally acquainted with Edward J. Corsi, as a fellow New Yorker, I have known about him and his governmental and political activities for many years. I believe he is a lifelong Republican. I know that he has held many important public offices and I have been told that it was at the instance of high Republican Party officials, including the former New York State Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, that Mr. Corsi became the candidate of his party for the New York City mayoralty.

The latest task assigned to him was at the hands of Secretary of State Dulles, and was one which required him to deal not with money or property, but with human destinies. No matter who may be right in this controversy between the appointing power and the appointee, one thing stands out clearly and that is there is an utter, if not a reckless disregard of the character and reputations of American citizens who undertake to serve their Government. The whole matter is as sordid as it is unfortunate. No government can expect its citizens to undertake to serve it in high and in important places when they are treated as shabbily as Mr. Corsi has been treated by the Secretary of State. If Mr. Corsi is as incompetent as the Secretary now pretends him to be, then the Department's methods and procedures of recruitment of personnel is sadly in need of revision. On the other hand, as is more likely the case, if the reasons that are now being given for the dismissal of Mr. Corsi are but poor excuses, then there is every justification for his demand for a congressional investigation of the whole affair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including the cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe; expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 2870, 2879, 287r); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; insurance of

official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than the others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen from United States vessels in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, held under leaseholds of less than 10 years and fuel and utilities for such properties, and (5) rental or lease, for periods less than 10 years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made in advance; \$63,760,000, of which not less than \$8 million shall, if possible, be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission (except that 15 such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed \$3,600 each) and \$1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this appropriation shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of the Metals and Minerals staff in the Office of Economic Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 2, line 11, after the semicolon, strike out the remainder of the line, and all of lines 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of several amendments which I propose to offer this afternoon. I shall not take long on any of them because I am pretty well aware of the fate which will attend the efforts to economize. This amendment would strike out the following language:

Expenses of the National Commission of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6

of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 2870, 287q, 287r).

Mr. Chairman, I challenge anyone in this room to give me evidence of substantial accomplishment on the part of the National Commission for UNESCO. Despite the language in previous appropriation bills, and despite language contained in this bill that no funds appropriated under the terms of this act shall be used to promote one-world government or one-world citizenship, the National Commission for UNESCO in its conference at Minneapolis a year or so ago gave recognition to an individual who advocated one-world government, and the State Department using funds appropriated by Congress, published several hundred, if not several thousand copies of the speech made by this individual who incidentally was branded by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as being a fellow traveler with many years of experience in that game. I know of no accomplishment, I say again, on the part of the National Commission of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation, and I offer this amendment so that the expenditures made for this Commission can be ended here and now, and so that money will be saved to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman has challenged any Member to rise to offer proof of any accomplishment by the National Commission on UNESCO. I have had some experience with it, and I am prepared to state from the observations I have made of the National Commission that I am convinced personally that it has served a most worthwhile and useful purpose in creating in this country an atmosphere of support for this organization, and in backstopping it in all of its activities which have been worthwhile. I have found no softness on the part of the National Commission and no weakness or any tendency toward one-world government or one-world citizenship.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to show the gentleman proof.

Mr. PRESTON. Is the gentleman speaking of this minister? Is he referring to the minister?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am referring to a minister; an individual who purported to be a minister.

Mr. PRESTON. I am not undertaking to defend the minister—I know nothing of him whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. But the National Commission for UNESCO recognized this same fellow traveler and then the State Department printed his speech and broadcast it throughout the world. If the U. N.—if UNESCO is the great and fine organization which the gentleman says it is, why have a commission to promote it? Why have a commission living off the taxpayers of this country? Why maintain this commission; what for?

Mr. PRESTON. You received a letter of apology from the National Commission?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I had to drag it out of the chairman.

Mr. PRESTON. Quite accidentally, but any reference made to the gentleman from Iowa was not in any way derogatory?

Mr. GROSS. That is the gentleman's opinion. It is not my opinion.

Mr. PRESTON. Did you not say in your district what this minister accused you of saying?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I said what he accused me of saying, but the gentleman from Georgia has not quoted any of the statements made by this individual. I refuse to be a party to supporting an organization which goes out to harass a Member of Congress and uses tax funds appropriated to the State Department to do it. Not for a moment am I going to sit quiet when that happens even though the gentleman apparently approves it. So I have offered an amendment to get rid of this superfluous commission, and the gentleman has not justified its existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that I would deplore readily any attack by anyone connected with the National Commission of UNESCO against a Member of Congress. The facts in this case are that there has been no attack made on the gentleman from Iowa. The language about which he complains is simply this, "And Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, assures his constituents that the United States is being taken for a ride by a bunch of foreigners."

The gentleman admitted a moment ago that he said that. Shall we condemn a man for simply repeating the truth? That is what has been done in this case.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. In just one moment. I do not defend this minister. I know absolutely nothing of him. He may be everything that the gentleman from Iowa says he is. But when we come to fixing blame we must go to the language used.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman also read into the Record, since he seems to have been well coached on this subject, what this gentleman had to say about the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other patriotic organizations? Will he also read a number of other things that this gentleman had to say?

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, I am not upholding this man.

Mr. GROSS. What is the gentleman doing, then?

Mr. PRESTON. I am simply saying that the gentleman has no right to complain when he admits that this minister said what he said he said.

Mr. GROSS. But I have a right to complain when the gentleman does not read into the Record this individual's reply.

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, I agree. I am not upholding this minister.

Mr. GROSS. What are you upholding him for?

Mr. PRESTON. I am not upholding him. I am upholding the National Commission of UNESCO.

Mr. GROSS. How can you, when they invite this kind of a man to speak to their conferences?

Mr. PRESTON. Let me put the gentleman straight. This gentleman was not invited to speak to the conference.

A board of ministers was appointed to select material for this conference in Minneapolis to use in considering wherein religion and our spiritual resources could be used to advantage in UNESCO. This board of ministers recommended that the speech written by this minister should be used as background material. The minister was not there. His speech was referred to a panel to consider as background material and in the speech was found the reference to the gentleman from Iowa.

Now, the National Commission has apologized. It said it got this thing up hastily, that had they known it they would never have considered that speech to be used as background material.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman also read into the Record the statement about the emerging one-world institutions?

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, now, understand me, I am not upholding him one minute.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman uphold the National Commission in prevailing upon the State Department to spend United States taxpayers' money to have this published and broadcast throughout the country?

Mr. PRESTON. I will say there were only a few copies of it printed.

Mr. GROSS. You bet there were a few.

Mr. PRESTON. Fifty dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent to multi-graph 2,000 copies.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and more than that.

Mr. PRESTON. That is what the record shows here. It was published, 2,000 copies.

Now, if we are to remain in UNESCO, we must use outstanding American citizens in this country, such as the brother of the President of the United States, such as Dr. Athel Spillhouse, head of the department of science of the University of Minnesota, and other great men, to look in on this organization, UNESCO. We need this organization in our country. I am convinced it is going in the right direction. After having attended two international conferences of UNESCO, I am prepared to state that while at first I had some doubt, yet after this last conference I am satisfied of the importance of what it is doing.

So I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated. Let us continue to use this national commission composed of outstanding Americans to act as a watchdog and supporting committee over UNESCO.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking today with some feeling. For a number of weeks some of my constituents and outstanding men and women in other districts and in other States have been working on a grass-roots program which they wished to submit to the Congress—a program of reaching more effectively the hearts and the minds of all the people of the world with the classic messages of American democracy that were the inspiration of our forefathers and from early reading have implanted in us an abiding and understanding faith in democratic government.

I have here a large file with a content that represents weeks and months of effort by good and distinguished Americans to find the path to understanding that leads to peace. That effort has resulted in a program, American grass-roots in its origin, representing I believe the commonsense thinking of the American people. I had hoped to present the program in the debate today when we had under consideration a bill of appropriations making funds available for spending in this field.

That you may understand the wide interest, here is a card from Dr. Harold E. Fay, managing editor of the *Christian Century*, a publication of large national circulation and of unsurpassed standing and prestige. It reads:

Will you please send me a copy of your forthcoming speech on getting the classics of democracy into the languages of nations now trying to establish democratic institutions. We want to provide some editorial support.

Here also is a letter from Mr. Burch, the associate editor of the *Chicago Daily News*, concerning the expected early publication of dispatches from all the foreign correspondents of that great newspaper on the availability or non-availability of the classics of American democracy translated into the languages of the respective countries.

The file is filled with letters from editors, educators, and others, men and women who represent a high cross-section of American thinking.

Now, having in mind my responsibility to present to the House to the best of my ability a program of such transcending promise, I telephoned yesterday four times to get a copy of the bill, of the committee report and of the printed public hearings. I was told they were not available, that the committee was still in executive session and meanwhile the documents were not being released. At 11:30 I called the distinguished Democratic whip and reminding him that within a half hour the House would be convening said that certainly I should have an opportunity to see the report. Through his graciousness and appreciated intervention, I finally did get a copy of the bill and of the report at 11:45. When I reached the floor I got a copy of the public hearings. I am indebted to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] in raising a point of quorum for the matter going over a day, thus affording me some time to examine the documents inaccessible to me until 15 minutes before the bill first came up.

Yesterday I spoke to my beloved friend, a great American, the chairman

of the subcommittee and I told him of my interest. He said, "I will see that you get time in general debate." I said that I did not want to take too much time but I did owe it to these people who had put in so much hard work. He said that I would get the time.

I spoke to him again today and he assured me once more. He said, "Of course, you are not a member of the committee but I will see that you get at least 5 minutes." Then later on the dean of my Democratic delegation from Illinois came and asked, "Have you spoken yet?" I said, "No, but I am sure my good friend, the chairman of the committee, will give me this time." He went and spoke to the gentleman and the word came back that I would be recognized.

Then general debate was closed. I am sure it was an inadvertence. I have no feeling for the distinguished chairman other than one of great respect as an able and outstanding statesman and of warm personal affection. I appreciate the difficulties of his position, with so scant an amount of time at his disposal, and I certainly excuse him from any intention to overlook me. I mention the incident in the hope that hereafter when bills of the vast importance of the one before us come up, general debate will not be limited to 1 hour a side. That amounts to shutting out any real debate and more or less closing the doors to those not members of the committee. All of us must share the blame for the too-brief limitation of the general debate since it was by unanimous consent. I hope we will be more alert on another occasion. For one Member I would sooner remain here in session until midnight every day rather than have one representative of the people feel that he had had no opportunity to speak the sentiments of the people of his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and Mr. ROONEY) Mr. O'HARA of Illinois was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I most humbly apologize to the distinguished gentleman. The situation with regard to allotment of time during general debate was entirely within my control. There were only 26 minutes left for all those on this side who wanted to speak, of which 15 minutes went to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a member of the committee. The rest of the allotment were all for periods of 1 and 2 minutes, with the exception of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who came to me before the gentleman from Illinois. I am sorry I did say he would get 5 minutes. After all it was within the province of the Member in charge of the bill to make a motion to limit debate. I assured the gentleman he would get his 5 minutes under the 5-minute rule. I do hope he has no hurt feeling because I love and respect the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I accept that as a very great compliment to my appearance of youth. I thought I was a little older, I thought life had given me enough years and experience to have learned that when a bill is up for reading and amendment a Member gets 5 minutes on his own and not as a gift from the Chairman who controlled time in general debate. The graciousness of the gentleman, however, in joining with me in the request for additional time now I genuinely appreciate. All I object to is being thought young and naive.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes remaining I shall address myself to the truly inspiring program which can be carried forward with negligible expense and which holds real promise of bringing all the peoples of the world in tune with democratic ways and aspirations.

Briefly stated, this is the program: Select 20 or 30 classics of American democracy, such as the Federalist and the writings of Thomas Jefferson, translate them into all the languages of the world, issue them in inexpensive paper editions and make them available at trifling cost to the little people everywhere. This was the literature that inspired and guided our forefathers in the task of building this democracy. It will inspire and guide those who now, in foreign lands, are looking for the light. It will bring them into closer understanding with us since the founts of our faith will come to be the founts of their faith.

The challenge to us in our generation is to win the hearts and the minds of the peoples of the world. Reports coming to us from observers all over the world are not reassuring. Our intention is good, our purpose is pure, but we are failing to make the most of our opportunity of impressing men and women in all the lands of the earth with the unselfishness of our mission.

We seek not 1 foot of foreign soil. Furthest from our thought is the dream of world dominion. All that we seek is to help others, as we have helped ourselves, to attain, under God and a good and just government, the physical well-being and the spiritual contentment made possible by an earth of rich fertility and the progress of science and industry.

Unfortunately, our purpose is not being projected in some of the programs of the present that take the negative rather than the positive approach and rely upon controversy rather than appeal to reason.

Constantly we tell ourselves that out of World War II has come not one world but two: the world of democracy and that of communism. Moreover, that the Communist world is dedicated with fanatical zeal to the objective of making one world, a Communist one. In our concern about subversion within our own portals, we pay tribute to the ways and wiles of Communist propaganda. At this point, it may be well to analyze our own propaganda coldly, objectively and to ask ourselves whether we are being outdistanced in that field by our opponents.

If our objective is to fire the imaginations of the people of the world with our own conviction that democracy,

which is our way of life, should be theirs, we must reach their minds and their hearts. That is our avowed purpose; how are we attempting to achieve it?

We are spending large sums on radio and television programs. The vast majority of the people we are endeavoring to reach have neither radio nor TV sets. But their leaders can read. Have we made available to that leadership the classics which have fired our own imaginations and been the cornerstones of our democracy in this Western World?

My information in this field is fragmentary but significant. For example in Paris, so I am told, we maintain one library on the Champs Elysée while the Russians have six book stores in the parts of Paris frequented by the "little people" where the classics of Marxian philosophy written in French may be purchased for a few centimes. This may not be the sole reason, but it is a factor in the growth of communism among the rank and file in Paris. The Communists have six book stores with the classics of communism vendable at a price the Frenchman can pay, while in all of France, the United States has six libraries, some not too inviting to the ordinary Frenchman.

The special study mission to southeast Asia and the Pacific of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] was a member, and the gentleman from Minnesota was chairman, reported:

The book translation program is making available to Asian peoples literature, both technical and general in content, that otherwise would not be available to them. In Rangoon, the study mission visited the headquarters of the Burma Translation Society. A well-stocked library of American works was being translated into Burmese by local translators. In an adjacent building, a modern printing plant, designed and serviced by American technicians and equipped with American machinery turned out inexpensive editions.

Further, the report concludes:

The literate minority represents an influential segment of the population.

As to libraries, the mission:

Most of the works are in English. In contrast, the study mission noted the large number of Communist works printed in the local language on sale in local bookstores for small sums because of heavy subsidy.

The market is there, as evidenced by the eagerness on the part of the population to absorb foreign ideas.

The criticisms which have come my way of our methods are: not only that in Europe but in Asia and Africa our library facilities are not located in areas accessible to the people we wish to reach but also that our books are not published in the language which those people who are literate can read.

Moreover, whereas in sending radio and television programs we judge others by ourselves, we do not project that thinking to include the influences which have built western democracy. Democracy is not a new model hat to be donned. It is a way of life which the Western World has developed during the centuries. A major factor in that development has been the printed as well as the spoken word.

That must be the media through which democracy should be presented as a positive and constructive idea and method. Checks of books available in our information centers indicate a negative, not a positive, approach. Many of the books which are available have been concerned not with a presentation of democracy but rather with attacks upon communism.

Moreover, many of the books listed by the USIA have been of recent vintage. For example, titles listed in special list SL-7 are of books published since 1940. I need not remind this body that democracy is a positive concept which did not begin in 1940, and that the literature in which our forefathers developed this concept must still have a spark of divine fire capable of further inspiration for people hungering for a philosophy which in 1776 produced a document founded on the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

A second criticism of our effort has been that instead of making available to readers the output of our geniuses, political and philosophical, we are presenting secondary sources, histories—not the works which have made important contributions to the evolution of democratic thought.

Are we making it easy for people to read our classics of democracy in their own language? Spot checks have elicited the following facts:

(a) There is one copy of de Tocqueville in the information center in Rome in English.

(b) There was available for sale in Italy an Italian translation of Democracy in America, but it is not cheap; therefore, it will not be widely read.

(c) A good Spanish translation of the Federalist was published in 1943 by the Fonda de Cultura Economica of Mexico. Has the USIA made this available, not only in Mexico but throughout Latin America? The objection has been made that the Federalist is hard reading. Is it fair to assume that the literate minority is less capable of serious reading and thought than were our own forefathers, among whom schools were rare when the United States was born?

If we are to appropriate funds for the continuation of USIA we must demand from them a report of their stewardship so that we may in turn report to our constituents whose questions as to the disposition of the dollars we spend for them deserve and must have answers.

Some of those questions are, or may well be:

First. To what extent is our USIA reaching a "grass roots" level?

Second. What classics have been translated into the languages which the literate of all nations can read?

Third. Who are the people who frequent the libraries which we have made available?

Fourth. What are they reading?

Fifth. To what extent have we subsidized the classics of democracy, thus making them available in their own language to people? If my information is correct, the answer here is "No"; since there seems to have been very little publication.

Sixth. Is there a demand for translations? Again referring to the report of the Judd committee:

The market is there as evidenced by the eagerness on the part of the population to absorb foreign ideas.

Let me remind you, the Communists are subsidizing extensively the publication of their books in native languages all over the world.

Further evidence of demand comes from the UNESCO translation program. My information is that their appropriation is overdrawn by requests from Italy, Germany, Spain, and India for assistance in getting out editions of such books as Locke on Toleration.

On the other hand, the Committee for Free Asia has found it necessary to expand their publication plans beyond their original conception because the demand for books has far out-distanced their supply. The book is the only thing that can get to any village in Asia where there is a schoolmaster or someone who can read.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note in the committee report that USIA requested an amount of \$350,000 for the Nonprofit Book Corporation.

I have looked into the Nonprofit Book Corporation and have made inquiry as to its purposes and its operations. It is my understanding that the primary purpose of this Corporation is to publish abroad in the languages of the various countries selected American books in full length, supplementation, paper backs, periodicals, and other interesting and informative condensations. It also establishes effective distribution and marketing arrangements for the sale of American books overseas, and assists in breaking bottlenecks in foreign publishing firms by lending technical assistance and facilities to them. The Corporation is governed by a board of educational, literary, and publishing leaders of the United States. It works with recognized foreign publishers abroad. This policy makes it possible to secure the cooperation and endorsement of distinguished civic and educational leaders of the foreign countries concerned to a degree that would have been impossible if the work had been done directly by a Government agency.

By using the local publishers, it is possible to reproduce a large number of useful publications at a minimum cost—at a fraction of the cost they would require here in the United States. Through this arrangement the Corporation has achieved remarkable success in distributing American books in quantities heretofore unheard of in the countries involved.

I believe its most important purpose is that this arrangement permits the publication of carefully selected books and pamphlets in large quantities without attribution to the United States Government so that the books thus produced are not stigmatized by the Russians and their stooges as false propaganda.

I note the committee report states:

No funds are included in the bill for the so-called Nonprofit Book Corporation for which \$350,000 was requested.

I would like to inquire why the committee recommended that USIA place greater emphasis on getting out unattributed materials rather than those which bear the USIA label, and then in the next breath, failed to appropriate funds by which the agency can most effectively do this very thing?

In raising this question, I am mindful that the committee eliminated all funds for the use of reproduction of "Profile of America" which I have had an opportunity to review and which I find to be objectionable, even obnoxious in parts, and otherwise not representative of American life and ideals. I can well understand the position of the committee and I compliment them for stopping immediately any further reproduction and dissemination of this ill-conceived and damaging book. Obviously, I do not have in mind this type of book when I advance the cause of the Nonprofit Book Corporation. There is no shortage of books or other publications which adequately and objectively present the truth about the American way of life and its ideals, and to me, the problem is simply that of selecting those for dissemination abroad which do objectively and fairly depict the American scene.

I wonder if the committee was aware that the Kremlin schemers in Moscow alone in 1953 subsidized the publication of a billion volumes of books in a wide variety of languages, many of them reproduced locally in the foreign countries. Most of this work is carried on by the International Book Publishing Corp., a semiautonomous branch of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade. It would be difficult to accurately estimate the exact amount of money the Russians put into unattributed publications, but it is safe to say that the amount is greater than the entire budget requested by USIA. I wonder, distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, whether the facts I have here presented, were taken into account when this decision was made, particularly in view of the fact that the committee urges USIA to place greater emphasis on getting out unattributed materials?

The Russians are far in advance of us in the issuance of pamphlets, books, and other information. As an example, in Moscow they have a Russian Printing Bureau which is going full speed ahead printing in 40 different languages, 24 hours a day. I would like to cite but one example of their activity. They have produced a book titled "Marxism and the National Question," two copies of which I hold in my hands. In my right hand I have a copy of that book in English published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow. In my left hand I hold a very fancy bound copy of that volume which was printed by International Publishers Co., Inc., New York City, an organization which is a subsidiary of the International Book Publishing Corp. in Moscow, a branch of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade.

This book is put on the American market at 30 cents a copy. The copy printed in the United States sells for 50 cents and as you can see, it probably cost well over a dollar to produce this book, making it evident that a heavy Russian subsidy goes into the printing of such books.

According to their own admission the Russians have produced slightly over 80 million copies of this book in 37 different languages. This book, I assure you from my own reading and analysis, lays out the strategy for the destruction of all nations and the destroying of the sovereignty of all peoples. This book was a primer for the agents and stooges of the Russians to subvert and to reduce to absolute tyranny all the non-Russian nations within the red colonial empire. This book sets forth the basic plan of the Russians to make all the nations of the world abject colonies of Moscow.

I have cited only this one example of the evil effectiveness of the false propaganda machine of the Kremlin.

Freedom's cause has yet to make an effort anywhere comparable to this single example I have cited.

I have other examples of the tremendous volume of books subsidized by the Communist conspiracy. For example, I have here a book from the Little Lenin Library, volume 14, called State and Revolution. This book also sells for the modest price of 30 cents. It is produced by the International Publishers Co., Inc., of New York. In the back of this book there is a listing of 29 different books of this same type, but of different titles, which are available in English. The price range of these books is 5 cents up to 50 cents. The vast majority of them, however, range between 15 cents and 20 cents per volume. Here again is clear evidence of the tremendous subsidy the Russians put behind the publication of the evil works of Marxism.

I also have here a de luxe edition of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This was produced by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow in 1945. As you can see, this is really a de luxe edition with high grade paper, exceptional binding, and would cost at least \$2 if produced in the United States. I repeat, this de luxe edition was published in Moscow in 1945, the year World War II ended, at a time when the suffering people of the Soviet Union were in grave need from the long effects of war. This is but another demonstration of the fact that the Russian Communists place greater emphasis on their propaganda tools and production than they do on the welfare of their own people and very likely even on the production of weapons for use in the traditional forms of warfare.

As an example of the special de luxe publications put out by Moscow, I hold here in my hand a color pictorial called Union Sovietica of May 1954. This is put out by Pravda and is in Spanish tailored for Latin American countries. This very expensive piece of false propaganda came to my attention as a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression on the occasion of our investigation into the

Communist seizure and takeover of Guatemala. This propaganda piece depicts life within the Soviet Union as a Utopia—a worker's paradise—the ideal life for the struggling masses. Obviously, this piece of high-powered false propaganda does not tell the reader about the realities of life within the Russian Communist Empire, such as the man-made famines which in 1 year alone took the lives of over 5 million people of the Ukrainian nation—mass deportations which brought about the destruction of entire nations in the course of 24 hours, such as the Chechen-Ingush nations, the Crimean-Tatars and the Kalmyks—it does not give shots of the slave labor camps such as Vorkuta, Magadan, and thousands of other such infamous places of terror and tyranny. Nor does it give the slightest hint about the Communist elite of the new superrace which the Russian Communists have created and who live a life of luxury which their own propaganda piece very well describes. The unsuspecting, after reading this clever and highly expensive propaganda piece, could very well be duped into believing that communism could bring benefits to humanity.

I have before me the Foundations of Leninism, published by the International Publishers, 381 Fourth Avenue, which is, of course, a subsidiary of Moscow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to show appreciation of the able and fighting chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the majority chairman, and also the able and fighting minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], and the other members of the committee for their great interest in the appropriation for the Department of State. Certainly there is no department today that really should supersede the Department of State in view of our very serious international problems. Much of the solution of whether or not we shall have war depends upon them. Of course we should not relax our efforts in building a very strong national defense in guns and ships and bombs. A strong national defense is essential. Our national defense should be second to none.

I hope very much the members of this Appropriations Committee will see fit to ask those in charge of the exchange of teachers and pupils to see that Ireland has an exchange of teachers and pupils with the United States. It would be very beneficial to both countries, the United States and Ireland, and to the other nations of the world.

I am so glad the committee has recognized the persons who have labored for years and who are laboring today in the Department of State and Foreign Service, often under great handicaps, often when they are misunderstood. They have been efficient; they have been fine; they have been courageous, and it has not been easy.

Again I express deep appreciation to all of the members of the subcommittee

who have fought to give the State Department a chance to do its best and most effective work. I like to have our fine, loyal representatives, especially those who are in foreign posts, know that they have the support and loyalty of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I first say to the chairman of the subcommittee that in speaking on the subject of the international educational exchange activities section of the bill I think the committee has done a very outstanding job in pointing out the deficiencies in the present execution of that program. But I think it would be a very sad thing if we allowed the deficiencies in the execution of the program to obscure the overall objective which I think today is one of the most worthy efforts in seeking a lasting peace throughout the world.

I would like to associate myself with the very wonderful remarks of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] from the other side of the aisle and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] on this side of the aisle, and particularly to call the attention of the House to that part of the report of the committee which makes the statement that "the committee feels that the program could be substantially reduced with regard to friendly countries where there is not Communist influence." I cannot help but believe that if we will carefully examine that we will recognize that in essence it says, "If you aren't against us we haven't got much interest in you."

It was only the day before yesterday when I had the privilege of a discussion with the former President of Mexico, President Aleman. He told me that throughout Central and South America one of the great criticisms of the United States is our lack of appreciation of their desire to understand more clearly what it is we are trying to do in our leadership of the free nations of the world. Rather than less, I think we must have more effort in this direction.

So I hope that in the legislative process on the Senate side we may have a reconsideration of the reduction in the amount of money appropriated for this purpose, and that we may show that not only are we interested in fighting communism where communism today has such a great influence but we are also interested in keeping communistic influence out of those countries that are our present friends or would be our friends if we would do a little to win them to our side.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to complement the remarks of the gentleman from California if I am able to do so. He has made a fine statement.

The world has shrunk a lot since my boyhood. When I was a boy in high school it took me longer to go the 16 miles from my home to Green Forest, Ark., than it would now take me to go to London or Helsinki.

I want to refer briefly to the international student exchange program. I am not quarreling with this great subcom-

mittee. I know what a problem they have to try to solve. But I do want to call attention to this phase of this program that they may have overlooked. It is not so much the know-how that concerns me. That is being taken care of all over the world by other programs of this great Government. We are sending our know-how to every corner of the earth that we can. The international student exchange program is our effort to send know-why to the uttermost parts of the earth. Even here in our own country, here in our own respective districts, there is often a great misunderstanding of the know-why. I represent a great district in the northwest corner of Arkansas in the Ozark Mountains. They want to know why, and they want to know why the boys in the cities think one way when, perhaps, they think another way. It is our responsibility as Members of this Congress to understand each other—not necessarily to know how but to know why. One great section of our country likes this sort of a program and another section of our great country wants another part of the program when we are all together in this great country. So one of the key features of the international student exchange program is not to teach know-how but to teach know-why, and while I am not quarreling, I hope that this appropriation can be increased so that it can go ahead with the work that has already begun and can continue to the end that the rest of the world will understand us and we will be able to understand them.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few remarks on the same subject discussed by the gentleman from Arkansas, namely, the international exchange program.

I note from the report of the committee on page 6 that some 6,660 grants were handled in the past fiscal year by the exchange program of the State Department at a cost of \$18,700,000. The same table reveals that the Foreign Operations Administration in its technical-assistance program had 5,005 grants at a total cost of \$136 million.

The committee has seen fit to cut down to \$12 million the appropriation for the State Department's exchange program. I would like to say to the committee that the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee on which I served last year and on which I continue to serve, had occasion to go into the exchange program and technical-assistance program of the Foreign Operations Administration and the point 4 program, and found that it was very poorly administered.

On the other hand, I have had some contacts with the exchange program handled by the State Department covering teachers, students, and foreign officials and have been impressed with the fact that that program has been very efficiently administered.

The fact that 6,000 persons were handled for \$18 million compared with 5,000 of FOA grants for \$136 million raises the question in my mind whether the

committee in this instance is not straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. When the \$136 million item for the FOA comes up, I hope they are going to be equally assiduous in reducing it.

I would like to point out that my interest in this subject stems in part from the fact that the University of Michigan in my home town of Ann Arbor, Mich., has always been regarded as a favorite educational institution for foreign students. This afternoon I received from the vice president and dean of faculties of the University of Michigan the following telegram:

This year 10.56 percent of our foreign student enrollment of 805 had United States Government scholarship aid. In 1952 15 percent of the same group had such aid.

On return to their homelands most of our foreign students assumed position of leadership in professional fields, many in governmental positions.

Because of the lack of scholarship support we are losing prospective foreign students of high caliber every day. We receive hundreds of applications from Korean students many of whom are excellent academic prospects who are often recommended by members of our military personnel who were stationed in Korea. Almost to a man we must turn them down for lack of funds.

Compared to the efforts which the Red Chinese and the Russians are making to draw into their educational system the promising young people from the free Asian countries the effort America is making is small. It should be increased rather than diminished.

May I urge you to do all in your power to extend our Government's program of scholarships for foreign students at American universities.

MARVIN L. NIEHUSS,
Vice President and Dean of Faculties,
University of Michigan.

I would like to express, with my colleagues who have spoken before, the hope that in the event there is a conference on this item, this subcommittee will not feel that they are bound to stand for the cut they have made in the international exchange program, and that they will feel, because of the sentiments expressed on the floor, they can accede to any increase in this item which the Senate may make.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to associate myself with the statement you have just made. The University of Minnesota happens to be in my district. Identically the same claim is made by the University of Minnesota regarding the exchange program.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself on the subject matter which is presently under discussion: the student exchange program. I shall try to make my remarks as brief as possible.

In the first place, I would like to point out that many of the problems which exist today in Communist-infested countries, particularly the countries of southeast Asia and of the Far East, can be traced to the fact that many of the

local leaders there have been Moscow-trained.

For many years, the Communists have opened their arms to promising young people of various nationalities who wanted to study abroad. They invited them to Moscow, and trained them there. After they were indoctrinated, they were sent back to their own native lands, to preach the Communist doctrine.

Many of those persons never had the opportunity to be properly apprized of our way of life and our way of thinking. Our schools were closed to orientals for generations. We just kept them from coming to our country. Today we are reaping the fruits of those policies.

Through our congressional study missions and through other ways, we have learned and know what the situation is in the Far East. We know that our student exchange program is one of the finest and most warranted efforts that the United States has entered into with regard to that region.

The student exchange program represents one of our most successful endeavors to apprise future foreign leaders of our American ideals and ideas. A curtailment of the exchange program would be a serious setback to American prestige and influence.

In the course of the Foreign Affairs Committee's study missions to the Far East, I have seen the results of this program. In every country that we visited, we found that exchange students, and local leaders who were sent to the United States to become acquainted with our people and our ways, became the finest ambassadors of good will when they returned to their homelands.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us why these 35 Chinese students do not want to stay in this country, and want to go back to Communist China?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure the gentleman will agree that if he were in China, he would be just as anxious to get back to the United States. I do not think that the students in question want to return to China because of the government there. After all, it is their own country. If we were kept in a foreign land contrary to our desires, we would be just as strongly intent on returning to our own land.

I do not think that this point is pertinent to the question whether we should or should not curtail the exchange program. However, I do believe that when those Chinese students some day go back to China, they, too, will become disseminators of a better understanding of our great Nation, of our way of life.

Mr. GROSS. If they are indoctrinated with our way of life, they cannot possibly want to go back to Communist China. Yet they do.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, they do, probably because they feel that they have a duty to perform. After all, the nationalistic tendencies are strong. Then, too, there are their families, their relatives, their way of life. However, as I already stated, I think that if they go back, they too will be able to instill into others in China what the United States stands for.

Mr. WILSON of California. Is it not your understanding that Mao-tse-tung and Chou-en-lai in their youth went to Moscow and studied the Russian traditions, and that perhaps that is responsible for their animosity toward us today?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There is no doubt about it. They are not the only present leaders in the Far East who were Moscow trained. We closed our educational doors to the oriental people for generations until a few decades ago.

Today I believe we have a golden opportunity to win over the minds of Asiatics, the minds of people in all foreign lands if we just have understanding of the problems and the opportunities.

I want to say at this time that the appropriation subcommittee has done a grand job, but we ought not to try to balance the budget at the expense of this particular program. That is a mistake.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. These funds go also to support leaders from countries in Asia and other countries to come here and learn our ways.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. DIXON. Does not the gentleman think it is a wonderful opportunity to better relationships with other countries and to get before the leaders of all those nations what America is doing and our way of life?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is my understanding that the great bulk of this money is to enable foreign students and leaders to come and learn our way of life, then return and teach their peoples the lessons they have learned.

Mr. DIXON. I think this program should be supported.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the committee will increase the appropriation for the student exchange program. We cannot cut the budget estimate practically in half, and still hope to have an effective program. I feel that the Congress would make a mistake in so seriously curtailing the funds provided for this purpose. I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to increase the amount for the educational exchange program to at least what was available in the current fiscal year. This amount will be substantially smaller than the original budget estimate for fiscal 1956, and it will represent a compromise between the budget estimate and the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some temerity and with great humility that I rise to challenge the gentlemen of the great Appropriations Committee, and particularly of this subcommittee, on any issue. I think moreover that many Members of the House know that foreign spending is not a subject on which I am apt to urge an increase; but I feel so strongly in regard to this proposed cut in the appropriation for the exchange of students that I cannot keep my seat.

I would testify that from my experience in Europe and particularly in south-

east Asia, and in Japan, and in Korea, as a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Wisconsin who just spoke is the able chairman, I am convinced that there are only two instruments in our foreign-aid program which in my mind can go unchallenged in plan, yes, and in results: One, as far as Asia is concerned, is our libraries where we seem to be reaching down into the hearts of crowds of people. And I should perhaps exempt from that commendation some of the libraries of Europe which I think are not well placed. The second is this international-exchange program, which I commend on two counts: Nowhere have I been that I have not found a warmth for this country among students who have been here. Nowhere have I been that I have not found understanding of what we stand for in the hearts of those students who have studied here; and nowhere have I been where I have not found nostalgia for what they experienced in their sojourn here.

I cannot believe that for the sake of \$3 million, or \$10 million, we can afford to cut a program which to my mind actually works.

And there is a second part of it. I come from a great university town where I have seen how the students who come to us from foreign lands also teach us something and give us an understanding of how they think, why they operate as they do, an understanding of their long traditions, a better means of approaching them with what we have to sell. Of course, I think that we have the greatest thing on the globe to sell, the concept of human dignity and of freedom of the individual.

I am hoping that when the time comes the gentleman from Wisconsin will offer his amendment. I would rather that the House take this step than wait for a conference. I would very gladly lend my voice and my vote to support this program which I think is basic to mutual understanding, basic for the creation throughout the peoples of the world of belief and faith in each other.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. She has expressed her feelings so eloquently. I speak for the University of California, in Santa Barbara, in my district. I know the things she has said apply so very, very correctly there. The system works perfectly and it is a highly desirable thing to continue.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to associate myself, on behalf of the University of Louisville, with the gentleman from Illinois who has so eloquently expressed herself.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the subject now being discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, for some time I have been very much concerned about the lack of comprehensive research and intelligence material dealing with the Communist propaganda emanating from every quarter of the world.

During the 2-year period with which I was connected with Radio Free Europe, the fundamental importance of such information was demonstrated again and again. The most subtle shifts in Soviet policy can often be recognized by thorough and exhaustive analysis of the direction or emphasis of the propaganda emanating from a particular Communist-controlled nation.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to the fact that the budget for the Office of Research and Intelligence contained in the committee report is \$173,000 short of the budget estimate of the USIS.

The Office of Research and Intelligence was created as a result of a survey done by Mr. Allen Dulles, and has proved a unique service which has long been overdue. This is the first time that the United States Government has had an organization specifically charged with following the vast and complicated activities of Soviet propaganda.

The office was not established until the fall of 1954, so that the budget for the current fiscal year—July 1, 1954—June 30, 1955—of \$658,100 not only does not cover the whole year's operation, but at no time has the office been fully staffed. Consequently, the amount recommended by the committee would actually cut back the operations of the office from its present level. The office is just now beginning to turn out the type of information required in something like sufficient quantity. I have just read one of their publications—Communist Propaganda Activity in 1954—which is a very valuable pioneer study. It must be done again next year, and done more completely. The additional \$173,000 requested for this office for fiscal year 1956 would be the minimum required to permit this organization to adequately follow, and we hope predict the moves of the Communist propagandists.

Without the \$173,000, the program of analysis of intelligence material, such as interrogation reports of Communist defectors and escapees, would have to be curtailed. Studies to detect inconsistencies between Soviet statements and actions would also have to be decreased.

The plans for research overseas would also have to be drastically reduced. This research not only gives unique information about the attitudes of people in the cold war, but also provides essential information in the effectiveness of both USIS information activities and Communist propaganda. At present, only a limited part of the world is being covered. More funds are necessary to permit this information to be obtained

about all the critical areas of the world, especially the Far East.

The Information Agency can only reach the correct policy and program decisions when it has accurate facts both about the effectiveness of its own operations and also about Communist propaganda activities. The Office of Research and Intelligence provides these facts. The additional funds requested for this office are required for this work. I vigorously protest the recommendation of the committee to limit the operations of this office.

Mr. Chairman, I also note on page 6 of the committee report that a budget of \$12 million has been set for the international educational exchange activities, a reduction of some \$10 million in the amount estimated by the State Department for this tremendously worthwhile activity. The explanation of this cut is that with the fiscal situation of the country as it is, limitations must be placed on certain programs which are of some value but which cannot be clarified as necessary.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this type of justification hardly fits the educational exchange activities. To me, governmental programs in which we are engaged for the purpose of sending students abroad and extending educational opportunities to thousands of students from every part of the world, are as necessary a form of diplomacy as exists in the world today.

Another program which I think is vital to the best interests of our country and which I hold to be a potent weapon in the conduct of the cold war against totalitarian communism is the program calling for an appropriation of \$350,000 for the publication of books illustrating the basic moral and philosophical foundations upon which American culture has been established. The subcommittee has seen fit to kill this appropriation in its entirety and thereby has scuttled a program which would have sent tens of thousands of booklets, appropriately entitled "Classics of American Democracy" into every part of the world.

The tragedy of this action, Mr. Chairman, is that it reflects little or no realization of the tremendous output of periodicals and publications of every character and description from the Communist world. These publications are not only for home consumption. Through an efficient system of distribution they find their way into every nation of the world including the United States. The essential point to me is that we simply are not competing with the Communists in the battle for the minds of men, women, and children in the critical areas where communism has not yet imposed its tyrannical yoke.

These are matters of vital concern, Mr. Chairman, for they play no small part in the cold war in which we are engaged and upon which civilization, as we know it, rests.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Western Hemisphere is our first line of defense. It is strategically, politically, economically a family of nations—of which we are a member. More than a third of all United States direct private

investments abroad are in Latin America—about \$6 billion. Two-way trade is \$6.5 billion annually. Latin America is our largest foreign supplier and our largest market for commercial exports.

No part of the Americas can be allowed to pass under the domination of a hostile power. Yet our partners to the south are under systematic, subtle invasion by the Communist world conspiracy. Communists subverted the Government of Guatemala and controlled it, acting on orders from Moscow, until the Guatemalan people threw them out. Even then they went underground and are now active again.

Communist Party members in the area are increasing and total well over 200,000. Directly and through front organizations they ceaselessly attack and discredit the United States, exploiting existing misunderstandings. Communist shortwave broadcasting to the area has shown marked increases.

Mr. Chairman, during the 83d Congress I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression. In its report our subcommittee stated:

Most important, the continuous intervention by the Soviet Union in the affairs of our Latin American neighbors constitutes a real and serious menace to the security of the United States.

To combat the Communist menace and to expose it as an evil manifestation of a hostile force is a priority assignment of the USIA in this area. The resources available for the job are not large.

The Agency operates 43 posts—in all 20 republics and in the European dependencies, Martinique and Trinidad. Authorized American positions total 129. In some small posts one American is stationed. Local citizens employed currently total 469. The field staffs with Washington support use all communications media, and where practicable produce materials locally.

The job goes on in an area of social, political, and economic ferment 6,000 miles long, with 171 million people. Phenomenal population growth—now about 2½ percent annually, double the world average—will bring this to an estimated 600 million by the end of this century.

Total dollar support available for the information program in Latin America for fiscal year 1955 is \$5.2 million—Agency and field; for fiscal year 1956, \$7.5 million is requested.

The Congress is now considering the budget request for fiscal year 1956 of the United States Information Agency. The Agency received \$77 million for its worldwide operations last year. It is asking for \$88.5 million for fiscal year 1956—to win men's minds all over the world to freedom.

Russia throws large sums, variously estimated at \$1 to \$1½ billion dollars a year, into the same project—to win men's minds to slavery.

We cannot allow the Soviet Union to win a victory in this ideological battle.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the USIA will not be hampered in its motion-picture program by the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations

which would restrict expenditures for this purpose of \$3 million. We should utilize every media of information available to carry on the war of ideas. When we consider that a single motion picture produced in Hollywood could easily cost \$3 million, the same sum is a small figure to maintain a worthwhile program for 1 year.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the report of the Appropriations Committee might give the impression that the international exchange program is concerned almost exclusively with the exchange of students. Student exchange is, however, only one of the ways in which this program is designed to promote our foreign policy. The activities in which grantees engage include teaching, lecturing, research, observations, consultation, and acquiring of specialized practical experience as well as study. I understand that in the current fiscal year, for example, about half of the persons financed in whole or in part are receiving grants for short visits in the United States for teaching and teacher development, for college lecturing and research, and for practical experience and training. While I have not been able to make a close study of the program, I am impressed by what I have learned regarding the interchange of well-selected and representative persons in all walks of life. I recall, for example, that in the city of North Little Rock, Ark., we had the benefit of an assignment of an exceptionally fine teacher from India, Mrs. Bhatia, who not only provided valuable instruction but was able to take back to the people of her country an extremely favorable impression of our way of life, and I know from what she had to say while here that she will eloquently present our point of view to the people of Asia.

Foreign leaders come to the United States to observe the American way of life and consult with our leaders in the fields of government, journalism, labor, management, youth, and community activities, and other fields. American specialists are recruited from among the most prominent persons in their respective fields of activity for the purpose of undertaking general lecture tours designed to acquaint foreign audiences with particular aspects of American life and institutions, or to advise and to consult with important foreign organizations and institutions at the request of the latter. Foreign specialists participate in planned programs of training or practical experience in this country. For example, foreign journalists work for short periods in American newspaper offices. Grants for the exchange of carefully selected professors or research scholars help to create or continue closer cooperation among schools, universities, and professional groups in our own and other countries. Many of these projects are directly related to an explanation of American institutions and practices—for example, the sending of lecturers to universities abroad to lecture in American studies and assist in the development of American studies programs at the request of the institutions abroad. School-teacher grants make

possible the exchange of American and foreign primary and secondary school teachers, the major cost for which is provided by the schools themselves, but which could not be carried out without United States Government grants. Teacher development projects for foreign primary and secondary school teachers and school administrators are carried out under the sponsorship of universities and colleges in the United States, in cooperation with State school systems throughout the country, through Department grants to the teachers. These projects include such subject matter fields as American studies, primary, secondary, and vocational education, school administration, and the teaching of English as a second language.

Through every fruitful type of exchange experience, therefore, the program builds up cooperative international relations and contributes to sentiment overseas which is favorable to the United States.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the cause of world peace is served by the exchange of persons program.

It was very disheartening to me, therefore, to find that the Appropriations Committee has made such a drastic cut in the amount of money for this purpose.

President Eisenhower called the exchange program "an important step toward world peace." A poll of American Ambassadors found them saying the exchange of person is our most effective program abroad.

Faced with these endorsements, it is difficult for me to understand why the committee has treated this program so harshly.

Under title I of the table "Comparative statement of appropriations for 1955 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1956" the committee leaves the impression that the reduction recommended in 1956 appropriations for International Educational Exchange activities amounts to only \$3 million below the amount available in 1955.

In truth, the 1956 budget request included an amount for \$3,577,547 for the educational exchange program with Germany and Austria which were consolidated in the 1956 budget. Instead of cutting the appropriation \$3 million as the report indicates, the cut amounts to \$6,577,547 or a 35.4 percent cut below the amount available in 1955.

We can make no better investment than in a program to create understanding and good will among the peoples of the world, and to increase American friendship and understanding abroad.

If the program is poorly administered, as some have said, steps should be taken to correct it, but we should not permit the program to be crippled or destroyed.

The estimate of \$4,100,000 for administrative expenses of this program does not seem unreasonable, considering the fact it is only 13 percent of the total appropriation request of \$22 million combined with over \$9 million from private sources for the grant program.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we poorly serve the cause of international understanding by drastic cuts in this program and I urge the Members of the House to give serious thought to full restoration of these badly needed funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 4, line 6, strike out the figure "\$63,760,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$61,900,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is late and I will be very brief. This amendment would cut the increase of \$1,860,000 which the committee has provided the State Department for salaries and expenses; in other words, it would cut the bill back to the \$61.9 million provided last year. The committee will say, I have no doubt, that this increase is necessary to take care of the increased salaries in the State Department, and so on, and so forth. Let me say to you that the State Department can absorb the increased salaries if it is so minded. We talk a lot about economy in this House and we seldom practice it. It is estimated we will have a Treasury deficit this year of \$4.7 billion. I hope the Members of the House are aware of that and the inflationary pressures generated by these annual deficits. It seems to me this is a good place, with this amendment, to start to save a little money, and that is the reason I have offered it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to point out that the pending amendment, if adopted, would strike out the \$1.5 million for the personnel improvement program instituted as the result of the so-called Wriston report; \$100,000 for staff strengthening which the committee feels they need, and the indication of the committee's sincere feeling in regard to their needing this would be evidenced by the fact that the committee cut this item by \$5,790,000. This amendment would also deprive the Department of \$260,000 urgently needed for new posts at Belo Horizonte, Brazil; Fortaleza, Brazil; Puerto Oaiday, Venezuela; Aleppo, Syria; Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa; Hyderabad, India; Abadan, Iran; and Mombasa, British East Africa. Such would be the consequence of adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman agree that the State Department can get rid of some personnel and absorb the increase that you have given them?

Mr. ROONEY. I am afraid to make any decision the way the gentleman would try to induce me to. The functions of the State Department and the Foreign Service, our representatives throughout the world, are far too important to consider on a basis such as this. I think they need these new posts. I think they need this money for staff

strengthening, and I think they need this money in regard to the personnel program. This is the unanimous position of the committee, and I say that every single member of the committee agreed to the cut of \$5.7 million, and every member of the committee agreed that this particular money was very urgently needed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 4, line 7, strike out the comma following the word "shall" and strike out the words "if possible" together with the comma following the word "possible."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strikes out the words "if possible." In other words, the language of the bill presently reads "\$63,760,000 of which not less than \$8 million shall, if possible, be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States."

Nowhere else in the bill, so far as I can find, do the words "if possible" appear to direct the State Department to use credits owned or owed to the United States. In other words, this makes it mandatory that the Department of State use \$8 million of credits that we have in foreign countries, instead of giving them the opportunity to crawl through the loophole of "if possible." I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

May I point out, in opposition to this proposed amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, that the words "if possible" were not inserted in this bill last year. We had to put them back at the urging of the other body. The committee has carefully considered whether or not we should insist that they use this amount of money in foreign currencies and credits. But it is possible that there might be one situation somewhere in the world which would throw this whole business out of kilter, with the result that there might be delay in getting funds to a post in some important area. For that reason it was the considered judgment of the committee—and again we were unanimous—to have the words "if possible" remain in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Could not that be true of other appropriations in this bill where you do not use the words "if possible"?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that his offer of this amendment might indicate that the members of this committee were not in full agreement with him that we should use every single bit of foreign currency and credit wherever possible. It would be utterly ridiculous to take any position such as that. But at the same time the committee must consider the possibilities, if we do not insert the words "if possible." We

are in agreement. This is a matter of procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), \$475,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 5, line 4, strike out the figure "\$475,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to get a little economy in this bill, if I can. Here is an item of almost a half a million dollars for entertainment purposes. It seems to me that we can dispense with an expenditure of \$475,000 by the State Department for entertainment. Let us not forget that there are entertainment items contained in other provisions of this bill, too. But this \$475,000 is the big entertainment item in the bill and should be stricken out. If the Members are interested in economy, they should vote for the amendment. If they are not, then continue this entertainment for foreigners. It amazes me that Congress spends this kind of money to entertain foreigners in order to get them to take our money. There is something wrong somewhere, if we have to spend nearly a half a million dollars to get them to take our millions.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRESTON. I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa ever entertains any of his constituents in his district.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. PRESTON. For what purpose?

Mr. GROSS. And the taxpayers of the country do not pick up the check, either.

Mr. PRESTON. For what purpose does the gentleman entertain his constituents?

Mr. GROSS. For what purpose?

Mr. PRESTON. To influence them?

Mr. GROSS. Because I want to entertain them.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman does not care about influencing them while he is entertaining them?

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman wants to state his personal position that is all right.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it true that the gentleman is not interested in influencing his constituents?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I am interested.

Mr. PRESTON. Surely. That is what we are interested in in the matter of using this money, influencing people abroad.

Mr. GROSS. But the taxpayers are not picking up the bill for the entertainment of my constituents. Does the gentleman mean to say that there is an

expense account for Members of Congress to buy liquor to be used to entertain their constituents? If the gentleman wants to open up the subject, let us get right down and dig into it.

Mr. PRESTON. Very well. I have been here 9 years. I have not found any source that I can use to buy any liquor to entertain my constituents. But I do manage to dig up a little out of my own pocket to entertain my constituents on the theory that if I fed them properly they would be more likely to vote for me.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you not ask Congress to vote you an expense account? That is what you are doing here for the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Seriously, may I ask the gentleman, Does he realize that with regard to this item there must be taken into consideration the fact that a great many Foreign Service officers abroad, in fact the bulk of them, are not people of great means? That they must entertain foreign officials at various times? The people in the lower categories of the Foreign Service should not be called upon to use their own money for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that \$475,000 will pick up the check for all the entertaining the Foreign Service officers want to do?

Mr. ROONEY. I think it might adequately cover it.

Mr. GROSS. For all Foreign Service officers?

Mr. ROONEY. There are other items of entertainment in this bill, such as for USIA. Has the gentleman not found them?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I have, but I would like to make a start on this one. Let us see what happens to this one, and then maybe we can strike out the rest of them as we go along.

Mr. ROONEY. Fine. I think we can depend on the commonsense of the House to vote down the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows this \$475,000 is not the difference between having all millionaire Ambassadors.

Mr. ROONEY. This is one of the important things in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman cannot convince me of that, and he knows it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Acquisition of buildings abroad

For necessary expenses of carrying into effect the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 292-300), including personal services in the United States and abroad; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$7 million, of which not less than \$6,250,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$750,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from New York where these buildings are going to be constructed. Do I correctly understand we are going to spend money for the erection of an office building in Hong Kong?

Mr. ROONEY. I should say to the gentleman from Iowa, my dear and very distinguished friend, that the amount of \$5 million was requested for construction as follows. These are new buildings:

Three million dollars in London, England.

One million one hundred thousand dollars in New Delhi.

Nine hundred thousand dollars for staff housing in New Delhi.

The rest of it was entitled "Projects development, \$400,000"; defense attachés' housing, \$200,000; and maintenance items, \$3.6 million. The committee cut this to \$7 million, and insisted that all of it but \$750,000 be used in foreign currencies or credits. The Department had requested \$2 million in cash. I think that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is one of the best informed men in the House with regard to this subject, and that we did a pretty fair job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I did not yield for a speech. I yielded for an answer to a question. Do you propose to erect a building in Hong Kong?

Mr. ROONEY. I thought I mentioned London, England, and New Delhi.

Mr. GROSS. Why at this time embark on the building of a structure in Hong Kong?

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman from Iowa brought Hong Kong into this picture. There is no money in this bill for a building in Hong Kong.

Mr. GROSS. Are you not proposing the immediate construction in Hong Kong of an office building?

Mr. ROONEY. What page of the bill is the gentleman looking at?

Mr. GROSS. Page 278 of your hearing. You have \$10,500,000 worth of property in London, England, now, do you not?

Mr. ROONEY. We are going to trade that property in London, England, and I think the American taxpayer will come out the better. I am sure the gentleman is glad to hear about this because this is his administration running this program.

Mr. GROSS. Have you disposed of that building in Marseilles, France in the red light district?

Mr. ROONEY. That was taken care of a long, long time ago. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] would not briefly say a word to assuage the feelings of my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, my feelings are not hurt. I am just trying to find out whether you are going to build a building in Hong Kong and spend more and more millions in London on buildings when you already have \$10,500,000 worth of property over there.

Mr. ROONEY. I have already stated and I will now once again state that there

is no money in this bill for a building in Hong Kong.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is this that is proposed here on page 278 of your hearings. It says "proposed for immediate construction an office building in Hong Kong." You tell me about it.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. GROSS. All I can do is read what your hearings contain. I do not know just what volume this is, but it is on page 278.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Insofar as the Hong Kong building is concerned, that was authorized in a previous bill and the money has been appropriated, and so far as I know, it is ready for construction. That is not in this bill. It has been authorized. The funds were authorized prior to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Then what new buildings do you have in this bill now? Are you going to build buildings in Matsu and Quemoy and any other places?

Mr. BOW. There are no buildings to be built in Matsu and Quemoy in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that because I have grave fear that we are erecting a building in Hong Kong that the Chinese Reds will one day gobble up and the same will probably be true of some other buildings proposed for the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has raised the question concerning a new Embassy in London. I think the House is entitled to know what the situation is in London and what is contemplated at this time by the committee and the Department of State. Many of the Members of the House who have been here for some time remember there is quite a good deal of history about our properties in London. We have on the Square in London, buildings on three sides. Some of them are very old. Some of them are under lease. We have one building which our Embassy office occupies where we have other tenants. Our own agency carries on its activities there, but under previous agreements we have tenants in the buildings of other nationalities. There are some security questions involved in that situation. Under the present arrangement, we are obliged to furnish the tenants in the buildings with meals and we furnish them with valet service. That is not a good situation. We have for some time been trying to work out the situation that we have gotten into in London which has not been good. A committee was appointed about a year and one-half ago composed of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Preston], the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Coon], and myself to make some investigations which we did. To make it as brief as possible, may I say to you that the plan has now developed whereby there are firm offers for the acquisition of some of the properties we own in London, where-

by money will be returned to the Treasury of the United States. We will dispose of much of the property around the Square, and on the west side of the Square it is anticipated to build a new, adequate office building for our Embassy. Actually, when all the transactions are completed, as they are now contemplated, not only will we be rid of a bad situation in London, not only will we be rid of our tenants to whom we give valet service, but we will have a new Embassy, properly built, for efficient operation, and when we are through we will actually return some dollars to the Treasury from the disposition of our properties in London.

Mr. GROSS. What do you mean by "valet service"?

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will go down to the Statler Hotel and ask to have his suit pressed, he will find out what valet service is.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me we are giving them a little of their own Socialist treatment.

Mr. BOW. Well, I do not know whether valet service is socialistic or not.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we own the building, and we rent it out to private individuals, in part.

Mr. BOW. We took over the building. We took over the building some years ago, which had long contract leases in them. We have it and we are stuck with it and we are going to get rid of it. We are going to return some dollars to the Treasury.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the committee for the action it has taken in this matter of our buildings around the Square in London. I was there a couple of years ago. I learned about the problem. I was in our Embassy, and I will say that the condition of that Embassy is a disgrace to our great Nation. I am very happy to know that you are taking hold of this thing now and that you are going to dispose of these undesirable buildings and that you will build an Embassy in London that is in keeping with this great Nation of ours.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to add this one thing, that under the agreement we have now on our foreign currencies with Great Britain, those funds can be used for two purposes; namely, exchange students and the acquisition of buildings abroad. So we have a limitation on how we can use these foreign currencies. Actually, the currencies will be used rather than dollars. I think the work of the State Department there and of our committee certainly will be to the benefit of this country.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee for a clarification of the section relating to "Acquisition of Buildings Abroad."

I want to start with the investigation conducted by the Brownson Subcommittee in March 1953, relating to the erection of five residences and apartment buildings by the High Commissioner of Germany. Some \$16 million was spent

of counterpart funds, in the erection of that housing.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield, may I suggest to him that this was not a matter within the jurisdiction of this committee, because this committee never appropriated the money for those buildings.

Mr. MEADER. That is just exactly the point. The man who did the housing construction or who was in charge of it was a Mr. Glenn Wolfe, who was Deputy High Commissioner. In a memorandum in which he described with great pride the housing development, there occurs the following passage in a memorandum of a conference:

Mr. Wolfe pointed out the total FBO budget this year was only \$2½ million and that he doubted whether an approach to Congress for additional funds for buildings at Bonn would be favorably considered.

In other words, this official of the American Government in Bonn, knowing that for all Embassy buildings around the world, Congress had appropriated only \$2½ million, by stretching the language in other statutes, undertook to spend \$16 million of nonappropriated funds on a project that was never approved by the Congress of the United States.

I would like to ask the chairman of this subcommittee whether or not it is the opinion of this subcommittee and the opinion of the House of Representatives that any such expenditure is not authorized under the language of this appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I am quite sure it is not.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contributions to international organizations

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress, \$28,079,977.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 6 line 11, strike out the figure "\$28,079,977" and insert "\$22,079,977." Insert a colon after the figure "\$22,079,977" and add the following: "Provided, That the United States contribution as a result of membership in any international multilateral organization shall in no case exceed the percentage contribution of the highest contributing foreign government."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply cut the appropriation for contributions to international organizations. The amendment is directed in part to our contribution to the United Nations. It would cut the appropriation \$6 million.

Members of the House know, I am sure, but to refresh memories I may say that our contribution to the United Nations is 33.33 percent or was when this handbook was brought out in the second session of the 83d Congress.

My amendment would reduce our contribution to 15 percent.

Remember, the Russian contribution is less than 15 percent; in fact, it is 14.15 percent. It would reduce our appropriation to 15 percent and make the further provision that in the future no contribution to the United Nations be more than 15 percent, and no contribution to any of the specialized agencies of the United Nations be more than that of the highest contributing nation.

The British are next to the Russians with a contribution to the United Nations of only 9.8 percent. France contributes 5.75 percent.

It seems to me that after all these years it is time for these foreign countries to begin to pick up their share of the check for the United Nations. Let me remind you again that this country today has a Federal debt of \$280 billion, greater than the combined debt of all the rest of foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is eminently fair, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, there is just one short question posed by this pending amendment: Shall we or shall we not belong to the United Nations?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not rising in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, but I would like to point out 1 or 2 things with respect to our contributions to these international organizations and to the specialized agencies.

In the fiscal year 1946 our total contributions to these agencies was a little under \$7,500,000. The figure reached the high mark in fiscal 1953, and that high mark was \$25,351,000. The estimated contribution for fiscal 1955 was \$23.7 million and I think the committee requests at this time an appropriation of \$23.9 million, which is an increase of almost \$200,000 over last year. This is nearly three and a half times the amount of money that we contributed to those same organizations in fiscal 1946. In other words, over a 10-year period we seem to have increased our contributions to the very same organizations by about 350 percent. I point out that in the case of the UN, in the case of the International Civil Aviation Organization, in the case of UNESCO, in the case of the World Health Organization, we contribute approximately one-third of the total budget. I am not in favor of withdrawing membership in any of these organizations. I have al-

ready spoken in regard to my feelings with reference to ILO, but I wonder if the Appropriations Committee has given consideration to the very decided increase in the amounts of our contributions, not in the amount of percentages but the increase in the actual amounts in the period I speak of, the last 10 years, and why it is felt necessary to continue these increases year after year after year.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, I think one reason can be assigned to the fact that the maximum amount we are permitted to contribute has been increased from time to time since 1946.

Mr. BENTLEY. I understood that our percentage in the UN was being reduced.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes. I am talking about the overall amount dollarwise. The percentage has been steadily coming down until it has reached the point of 33⅓; but the ceiling has been lifted legislatively since 1946. I think that accounts for the increased budget of UN.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that even though our proportionate share has been decreased—and I led the fight to cut our share of U. N. contribution to 33⅓ percent—the activities of the U. N. during the decade referred to have increased, the total contributions of other countries have increased, so that it means our proportionate share is larger in dollars even though it is smaller in proportion.

Mr. PRESTON. That is true. That is a very accurate statement.

Mr. BENTLEY. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. In other words, the activities of the U. N. and these other specialized agencies over the past 10 years have increased if we follow the dollar amounts by 350 percent. That would seem to be an awfully big increase on the part of the U. N. and the specialized agencies.

Mr. PRESTON. I would not question the gentleman's statement on that.

Mr. BENTLEY. I am quoting from a pamphlet entitled "United States Contribution to International Organizations," House Document 89, \$7½ million in 1946, \$24 million in fiscal 1956, a 350 percent increase.

Mr. PRESTON. Of course, when an organization is created there is no active program. As it goes along, the program is enlarged. That is true of the U. N. and its related agencies.

Mr. BENTLEY. Is a similar growth going to continue in the future?

Mr. PRESTON. Frankly, I do not think so. I do not know what other field we can get into.

Mr. BENTLEY. For our contributions to these organizations you have requested an increase of \$200,000 over the last fiscal year, or approximately \$200,000, is that correct?

Mr. PRESTON. I am informed by our staff member that the overall appropriation for this purpose is less than that in the way of contributions.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the U. N. or any of these other organizations in which we are a member votes to increase, and we have a vote too, yet we have to keep on paying more money, is that it?

Mr. PRESTON. If we abide by the rules, we do. If the budget is increased annually or biennially, we are bound to increase our contributions.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Would this amount of money that the gentleman from Iowa wants to cut out close up the U. N.?

Mr. PRESTON. I think the answer is yes.

Mr. BENTLEY. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: As I understand it, our contribution for the current fiscal year was \$23,729,000?

Mr. PRESTON. No, that is not correct. The correct figure for 1955 is \$24,278,478.

Mr. BENTLEY. \$24 million.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes. The estimate for 1956 is \$23,901,243, or a reduction of \$677,236.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to see it decrease.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, in view of the periodic agitation among some groups in this country to have the United States withdraw from the United Nations, I was pleased to see the statement in the record of the hearings on this bill by our Ambassador and chief delegate to the U. N., former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge.

In answer to a direct question from a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee as to what would happen if we did withdraw from—get out of—abandon the United Nations, Mr. Lodge said:

We would be in terrible trouble. It would be a most imprudent thing to do.

After stating that it was his belief that had we not been in the U. N. last June when the Soviet Union tried to bring the Guatemala question into the Security Council the action would have torpedoed—to use his word—the whole Organization of American States, endangered the Panama Canal, and spread communism all through Central America, the United States Ambassador to the U. N. added:

If we ever were to be imprudent enough to get out, we would be turning it over to them [the Soviet Union and its satellites]. They would regard us as the biggest fools in the world if we did a thing like that. We just can't afford to get out. That is the minimum to be said, because I think we get a lot of plus from it. It is actually a great asset for us. It is the biggest single engine in the world for influencing world opinion. It is a great asset for us to have a place like that where we can go and try to influence world opinion, where we can go and show up the Communists in debate and reveal the hateful and ruthless things about communism. But the very minimum of it is that if we are not there the Communists will be there and they will run it.

I was glad to read those words, Mr. Chairman, and to note the importance which Ambassador Lodge places on our continued membership in and participation in the United Nations.

For a time it appeared to many of us that the new American delegation to the U. N. these past 2 years was inclined to

minimize the importance of much of the work and to indicate a feeling that our participation was in many respects a waste of time and effort.

I do not say that was general or that it characterized all of the official delegates, but it certainly was true of some of our representatives to the U. N. in 1953 and 1954 and in the attitudes they demonstrated.

RELUCTANCE TO JOIN IN SPECIAL CONFERENCES

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there was a reluctance on the part of the State Department to participate in conferences on proposed U. N. treaties in the areas of human rights and social welfare—reportedly because of a fear of attack from the groups supporting and promoting the Bricker amendment.

I hope we are safely through that gun-shy or U. N.-shy phase and that Mr. Lodge's unequivocal endorsement of the value of our participation in U. N. affairs means we will have official representatives at any and all U. N. conferences on proposed treaties, whether we intend to sign the treaties or not.

The point is that it never hurts for American representatives to use their best efforts in these conferences to have such treaties and conventions come as close as possible to meeting the ideals of freedom and democracy. Staying away from these sessions merely gives other nations, including the Communist ones, the opportunity to sway U. N. decisions without hindrance from us.

My interest in this matter was first aroused by an editorial last fall in the weekly Baltimore Jewish Times, entitled "A Shortsighted Policy," protesting the failure of the United States delegation to participate even informally or in an observer role in the U. N. conference on the status of stateless persons.

The editorial declared that the State Department appeared to take the position that because American standards of treatment for refugees, and aliens generally, were so much more generous and enlightened than even the best U. N. treaty on the subject would likely provide, little purpose would be served in our participating in the conference. But, the Jewish Times added, this certainly did not absolve us of the responsibility to give leadership in the effort the U. N. was undertaking to raise the level of human rights everywhere. To take a contrary position, the editorial said, would be to justify our withdrawal from the entire area of international cooperation on human rights, for in virtually every field our own standards go far beyond what international agreement is likely to establish at the present time.

STATE DEPARTMENT VIEW SOUGHT

I brought this editorial to the attention of the State Department on November 4, with a request for comment.

In my letter I stated:

While I am sure there is no official United States inclination to abandon the United Nations as a significant instrument for progress in the field of human rights (a fear indicated in the editorial), nevertheless I think the editorial is correct in pointing to a widespread suspicion among U. N. nations that we are somewhat halfhearted in this respect—a suspicion the Kremlin tries assiduously to cultivate. It is ironic that the

Communists, who deny all human rights, seem able so often to make capital out of the alleged shortcomings of the free governments; we should certainly not provide them with opportunities on a silver platter to claim we are unconcerned about U. N. matters of this nature.

In a reply on behalf of the State Department, the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary, assured me that Department's policy is to participate in discussions of human rights proposals in the United Nations, and has proposed an action plan on human rights.

His report on the matter of the conference on stateless persons was as follows:

Your concern for a positive expression on human rights matters by this country is fully shared by the Department, and we are glad to be assured of your interest in effective action in this field. The editorial in the Baltimore Jewish Times takes the position that since the United States standards regarding human rights are higher than may be possible to achieve through international agreement, a justification of our absence from the conference on stateless persons on this ground might likewise justify our withdrawal from the entire area of international cooperation on human rights. In our view, this conclusion is not supported by the particular facts relating to the conference on stateless persons, nor by our record in the United Nations.

The United Nations conference on stateless persons, which met in New York in September of this year, was called for the relatively limited purpose of drafting a protocol to extend to stateless persons certain provisions of an earlier convention for the protection of refugees. The United States participated in the conference of plenipotentiaries in 1951, which drafted the convention for the protection of refugees, in the hope of encouraging liberal provisions. Our experience there indicated that the problems faced by countries where large numbers of refugees are located differ substantially from ours. Much of this difference arises from their proximity to areas of persecution and also from the fact that these countries seldom accord the privilege of naturalization to any large number of aliens. Further difficulty arose because many of the proposals which seemed likely to be helpful to refugees and stateless persons in these countries dealt with matters of education, employment, and social benefits, which under our Constitution are wholly or in part within the jurisdiction of the States. There seemed little possibility, therefore, of our making a useful contribution to a conference designated to extend the provisions of the convention as adopted to an additional group.

As Secretary Dulles has stated on several occasions, the policy of the United States is to participate in discussion of human rights proposals in the United Nations, including conventions desired by other nations. In accord with this principle, United States Delegates have participated regularly in the Commission on Human Rights and related meetings. In the current session of the General Assembly, our delegation has participated in discussion of the proposed Covenants on Human Rights, even though the United States has already announced that we do not expect to ratify the covenants when completed. In addition, the United States has proposed an action plan on human rights in the United Nations, and is actively seeking support of other countries to bring it into effect. I am enclosing a statement on the program presented by the United States Delegate, Mrs. Lord, in the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in 1953. Enclosed also is a folder regarding the celebration of United Nations Human Rights Day, December 10, in which the United States has

cooperated regularly with other members of the United Nations to celebrate the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Sincerely yours,

THURSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES POSITION ON THIS CONFERENCE
WAS CAUSE OF SURPRISE

According to news accounts of the United Nations Conference on Stateless Persons which occurred in New York last September, Mr. Chairman, the position of the United States in declining to participate caused much surprise—and was attributed to the drive for the Bricker amendment. Interestingly enough, the Assistant Secretary's letter to me on the conference touched on the edges of this matter by referring to conference consideration of "matters of education, employment and social benefits which under our Constitution are wholly or in part within the jurisdiction of the States."

A very interesting editorial in the New York Times of September 14 commented on the absence at this conference of both the United States and the Soviet Union, and said:

This is the sort of conference in which one would expect the Russians not to participate, because Russian totalitarianism has been since 1917 one of the primary reasons why there are so many stateless people in the world. And it is the sort of conference in which one would equally well expect the United States to participate because of the deep humanitarian interest this country has always had in alleviating the problems of refugees and particularly of political refugees.

The people involved in the category "stateless," Mr. Chairman, are often in a most pitiful situation—citizens of nowhere, aliens in whatever land they happen to be, and often unable to acquire citizenship.

The stateless status may have been through accident of birth or marriage, through the conflicts of different nationality laws, or even through political changes of frontiers.

For instance, untold numbers became stateless after World War I in the break-up of the Austria-Hungarian empire, when new countries were born and tens of thousands of the inhabitants of the old empire lost their nationality without acquiring a new one.

Children born of stateless persons have inherited that man-without-a-country status. A woman may lose her nationality on marriage to a foreigner without acquiring the nationality of her husband under his country's laws, and so on. There are also cases of persons who have renounced the protection of the states of which they are nationals—I assume many escapees from behind the Iron Curtain fall into that category.

It is, I believe, too bad that our delegation to the United Nations did not sit in on these discussions, because these are questions involving basic rights and freedoms which we hold dear as a people.

The full text of the New York Times editorial on this subject is worth reading, Mr. Chairman, and I include it as follows:

THE STATELESS

A conference of 26 countries opened at the United Nations yesterday to consider the broadening of legal protection and of civil

rights for the millions of stateless persons who, as a result of wars, territorial transfers, and political persecutions, have no citizenship or land they can call their own.

This is the sort of conference in which one would expect the Russians not to participate, because Russian totalitarianism has been since 1917 one of the primary reasons why there are so many stateless people in the world. And it is the sort of conference in which one would equally well expect the United States to participate, because of the deep humanitarian interest this country has always had in alleviating the problems of refugees, and particularly of political refugees. But the fact is that neither the Russians nor we are taking part.

The official and doubtless the principal reason that no United States representative will be present at the sessions is that the conference is of limited application so far as we are concerned and that stateless persons legally here already have all the rights of aliens in this country and no discrimination is practiced against them as such. However, the United States has been a welcome participant in the drafting of other United Nations conventions and pacts that we have said in advance we would not sign.

This is why we are conspicuous by our absence from the present conference; and it is also why there has been a tendency to look for further reasons for American non-participation. The account in this newspaper yesterday suggests that one such reason may be the pressure put on the administration during debate over the Bricker amendment, to steer clear from deeper involvements in U. N.-sponsored treaties, especially in the area of human rights and social welfare. There may be good reasons why the United States should not sign and ratify such conventions; but participating in their drafting is another matter. It will be most unfortunate if the impression gets abroad that we have become U. N. shy as a result of Brickerism.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks immediately preceding the last vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

International educational exchange activities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to enable the Department of State to carry out international educational exchange activities, as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-1479), and the act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)), the act of August 24, 1949 (20 U. S. C. 222-224), and the act of September 29, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 225), including salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$1,000); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; and actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains

of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; \$12 million, of which not less than \$8 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,400,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: On page 12, delete lines 14 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu the following:

"Under this appropriation \$18,500,000 of which not less than \$12 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, provided that not to exceed \$3 million may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed would partially restore the amount of the budget estimate for the international educational exchange activities.

The entire budget estimate for these activities for fiscal 1956 amounted to \$22 million. The Appropriations Committee reduced that amount to \$12 million, at the same time placing a \$2.4 million limitation on administrative expenses and recommending that not less than \$8 million of the \$12 million be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States.

I sincerely believe that this substantial reduction would strike at the heart of the program and severely cripple our international educational exchange activities. While the motives of the Appropriations Committee are understandable, in view of the fiscal situation of the Nation, it would appear to me that a severe curtailment of this particular program could prove very disadvantageous in the long run.

It has been pointed out in the committee report that a relatively small portion of the foreign students attending institutions of higher learning in the United States during the 1953-54 academic year participated in the State Department's international educational exchange program. While this is very true, it would appear shortsighted to even further curtail the number of foreign students participating in this program.

Further, because I believe that the number of exchange students mentioned in the committee report has not been adequately broken down, for example as to how many are participating under private sponsorship and how many are participating under public sponsorship. Then too, the number is not broken down by areas or countries. We do know that there are some foreign countries that are better able to send students for higher learning to the United States while there are certain areas in the world where we cannot expect either the people of those countries or the countries themselves to send students to the United States for higher learning.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, although I do it rather reluctantly because I, too, do not like to see additional foreign spending, and it is not very pleasant to sponsor an amendment to an appropriation bill to increase an amount for any purpose—but because the exchange program is vital and proven effective I offer the amendment which proposes to increase the appropriation for this purpose by \$6,500,000, making the total \$18,500,000 as compared with the Budget estimate of \$22 million, and with the committee recommendation of \$12 million. I have recommended the \$18,500,000 figure because it roughly corresponds to the amount spent for the program during the current fiscal year.

In addition, the amendment that I have offered calls for a limitation on the administrative expenses, which has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee. I feel, however, that the \$2.4 million recommended may be overly stringent, and I propose to increase that amount to \$3 million. I believe the principle is sound and good.

Finally, my amendment would retain the third feature of the Appropriations Committee's recommendation to the effect that foreign currencies and credits be utilized to a larger extent in this program. That feature of the Appropriations Committee's recommendations I think represents sound and good policy. However, I have increased the amount to not less than \$12 million for that purpose.

It is my sincere belief that the amendment which I have offered proposes a compromise between the original budget estimates and the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. This compromise, nevertheless, would enable the Department of State to continue the International Exchange Program to the extent to which it has been carried out during the current fiscal year. It would at least keep the program alive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have given a great deal of thought to this exchange program during the 7 years I have been on the committee which dealt with it. I have participated in appropriating various sums for this purpose. I have taken every opportunity to interview people who have been engaged in this program either as professor or as student. I am now of the opinion that the time has come when we must reappraise this entire program. At one time the situation was quite different in Europe from what it is today. I think it is a fair statement to say that the real good that we hope to accomplish from this program comes from the people whom we plan to bring into the United States rather than the people whom we send abroad.

Our difficulty largely stems from the fact that the American movie industry has portrayed this country in such an unfavorable light throughout the world. It was before travel was as easy as it is today—before people had the opportunity to visit abroad and find out for

themselves—that we became known as a nation of soft people who spend most of their time in revelry and good times rather than in hard work and productive effort.

The people who come over here are convinced that that is not true once they come here and see our system, but we are the misunderstood nation of the world. No one will argue with me, I think, when I say that, despite all the great altruistic effort we have made in the field of foreign aid, we get very little credit for it in the countries where it has been largely applied. But when they come here and find out that the bighearted American people are really bighearted, that they have the altruistic motive in mind when they send these sums abroad, and that we are not trying to make money on the foreign people, that we are trying to help, I think they do change their mind.

I have talked to many Americans who have gone abroad and come back with a disillusioned idea about the country they went to.

So I think the time has come that we should reappraise this program. Let us keep it on a \$12 million level until we can study it again and see where the emphasis should be placed. I personally think it should be placed on bringing people to this country and letting them see the unbelievable; open the eyes of the people who have been blinded by the wrong kind of movies and propaganda that has been used against us. I do not think we are going to accomplish anything by sending a professor to the University of Zurich, and that is in here. I do not think we are going to accomplish anything by sending people to Australia. They are among our most loyal friends in all the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman believe the amount you are recommending is adequate to bring people to this country?

Mr. PRESTON. If we applied it all to bringing people over here, we would double the amount we have in here, I am sure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Could the gentleman give us a breakdown percentage-wise of the amount of money appropriated in the bill in the exchange program for people coming to this country and those being sent abroad? Does the gentleman have that?

Mr. PRESTON. I will refer that question to Mr. Howe. If he will produce the information, I will gladly give it to the gentleman later during the debate. But I am strongly of the opinion, having watched this thing in practically every country, I think, that we ought to bring more people here and send fewer professors and students abroad.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. I have worked with these professors who have been sent abroad. I have worked in institutions where I plead with our American professors to try to understand the point of view of these foreign students. For the life of me, in our institutions I could never get our own professors to

understand their point of view. These professors who have gone abroad I have placed in charge of the guidance functions for foreign students. They are the most invaluable people you could find. Does not the gentleman think it is worth a little money to do that?

Mr. PRESTON. It is worth something, of course. It is not all waste. But I think the real good comes from those we bring to this country. We have a country difficult to understand. We have the Utopia. There is no other place in the world like it. You cannot compare it to any other country in the world.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. May I ask whether anything in the wording of this bill guarantees that the reduction will be made completely on those who are going to be taken from this country to a foreign country? I find nothing there.

Mr. PRESTON. Not at all.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wanted to be sure there was something that stated it would be so used.

Mr. PRESTON. I prefaced my remarks by saying I think it is time to reappraise the program. Let us see what ought to be done, whether we ought to place emphasis on Americans going abroad or whether we should bring people here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would these funds be used to bring Russian farmers to this country to study our farming methods?

Mr. PRESTON. That could be, I suppose. I do not know. There we have gotten into the question of the Immigration Act.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder what funds would be used for bringing Russians here.

Mr. PRESTON. I would not want to prejudice these funds by saying that is true. I am afraid I would not be in a position to answer it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like, if I could, to get an answer to the question put by the gentleman from Wisconsin because I think it is important. I think it will show this money is being used approximately 5 to 1 to bring people to this country and not to send Americans abroad.

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, if you looked at the sheet that I looked at in the hearings, you will find that we are sending plenty of them abroad to places, as I said Australia, the University of Zurich, England, and friendly countries with which we have the finest relationship.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman will agree it is necessary to have some degree of reciprocity. We do not want to have it entirely a one-way street, but I am interested in a specific answer if we can get it.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes; Mr. Howe I am sure, will do so in just a moment. There are plenty of Americans going abroad. They are flying and sailing. There is no

problem of getting Americans abroad. The world is overrun by American tourists today.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But I am talking about Government employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall probably not take the 5 minutes, but I would like to clarify further the discussion which I had with the gentleman from Georgia. I would thoroughly agree that my own major interest in the program, sir, is in bringing foreign students to this country. But I am concerned because I find nothing in the bill or in the report which would guarantee that the reduction would not be across the board; or in other words, that there would not be a very substantial cut in the bringing of students to this country. May I therefore ask if you understand that the limitation would be put only on the students from this country whom we would otherwise be sending abroad, or will there be a four-fifths proportionate reduction in the number of those foreign students whom we otherwise would bring over?

Mr. PRESTON. If I may respond to the gentlewoman, we do not make that reduction. There is nothing here that would do what I would like to see done. The Department outlined a program and it provides for 1,727 Americans to go abroad and 5,443 foreigners to come into this country.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman. I hope he will not think me unduly unkind, if I, therefore, point out to the House that I think his very well-turned argument against the amendment was perhaps a bit irrelevant. I wish to add this testimony. Quite recently, some of us had with us one of the most able Americans in the Far East, who told of having taken a boat from Djokjakarta, en route to Manila. Practically at every dock where that boat stopped there were young Indonesians taken aboard to go to Communist China for higher education. Why? Because in the Orient today, with the closing of the Christian-American universities in China itself, there is almost no place for higher education except Communist China. To me that presents a challenge. I was delighted during recent months to note that Singapore was to have a great university, to take care in particular of the needs of the millions of overseas Chinese; but I understand this week that probably by Communist influence, the building of that university has been stopped. I feel strongly that the danger of letting students from southeast Asia be forced to go to Communist China alone for higher education, is something this country might well face at this time when we are spending billions upon billions of dollars to send guns and jet planes and all the instruments of war abroad, in an effort to combat Communist aggression. I certainly hope that this amendment may be accepted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see if we cannot agree on a limitation of debate. We have discussed the subject of the educational program for quite a bit of the time today, and there has

been no objection to the prolonged debate. I now ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have been making progress toward world peace. We have been doing it by the old-fashioned method of getting people from around the world better acquainted with us. That program, which has brought students, teachers, technicians and leaders to our shores to see America, is known as the exchange-of-persons program.

A German teacher, after spending a year in America, said, "I do not believe that the world became smaller by technology, but it becomes smaller in making friends."

For many years, this effort to create friendship and respect by an exchange of persons has been an important instrument in our foreign policy. I should like to see it become stronger and more effective.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the actions of the Appropriations Subcommittee in slashing funds for the program will do this Nation any good. A budget request was made for \$22 million—and that has been cut to \$12 million, with \$8 million coming from foreign currency. That means drastic cuts in our programs, with sharp slices in the administrative budget.

It is estimated that, if the House report is accepted, the entire exchange program will be cut about one-third.

This cut will effect the highly important leader and specialist program by reducing it 50 percent in most areas of the world and in Europe by more than 90 percent. That means we will not have foreign editors, political figures and opinion leaders visiting our shores and carrying home the message of America.

The program of exchanges with Latin American countries will be reduced by 40 percent. After our recent nasty experience with some Latin American nations, it would appear to me that it would be better to increase that program 40 percent, to increase the friendship, respect, and understanding for our country in that area of this hemisphere.

All of us are familiar with the teacher-exchange program. Probably every Member in this body has had a foreign-exchange teacher in his district. A check will reveal the great good that has come from that opportunity to expand international understanding. If we adopt the House report to cut this program to \$12 million, we will cut the teacher-exchange program well over 50 percent.

In addition, we will practically eliminate programs in such important and sensitive areas of the world as Indonesia, Iceland, Iran, and Spain.

I say that we are making a mistake if we withdraw from this very important activity—especially at a time when the Soviet Union is placing more and more emphasis on a stepped up cultural offensive. It has been estimated that in 1953, the number of exchange visitors to the USSR was more than 10,000 people. In addition, Soviet artists, scientists, dancers, musicians, and athletes are touring the world, trying to create a picture of Soviet cultural superiority.

It is no secret that the men in the Kremlin are active in every section of the world where there may be opportunities for making ideological inroads. We are mistaken, I am sure, if we believe we can capture the hearts and minds of men with an overpowering military machine, without giving the citizens of other nations a chance to observe us and to know us better.

Surveys have shown that attitudes of foreign people change dramatically after face-to-face meetings with our people. We should heed the testimony available to us on the far-reaching favorable effects of the exchange of persons program.

Our exchange selections include teenagers, teachers, specialists, and administrators. It attempts to reach into every area of the world where United States prestige may be threatened, and it attempts to bring, as far as it is feasible, representatives from academic circles, workers in factories, farmers and miners, and certain people generally classified as "opinion leaders" in their own countries.

Over and beyond the Government program are the exchanges provided by private groups in cooperation with the Department of State. It is estimated that at least \$7,800,000 was contributed from non-Government sources in support of the program last year. In turn, the Department of State assisted many groups, individuals, and foreign governments as well, in carrying out exchanges that will contribute significantly to the goals of the program. About 450 projects under auspices of persons outside Government, involving 3,400 exchanges, were promoted during last year. This cooperation, not alone for the number of exchanges encouraged, is worthy of note because it signifies opportunities for further expanding the program.

A program of this type is measured not alone on the basis of bigness nor on the basis of money spent. Its effectiveness is best calculated by sounding sentiment among those who are in contact with it.

In reply to a questionnaire, 193 out of 300 academic institutions polled, showed overwhelming support for the exchange program. Eighty-seven percent of the college administrators consider the Educational Exchange program to be worthwhile and effective.

Two special congressional committees recommended strengthening the whole program. The first, headed by Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, reported:

In comparative rating of the various media, it is generally conceded that the

exchange-of-persons program under the Fulbright program is among the most effective instruments for the creation of mutual understanding and good will.

The report goes on:

The strength of the exchange-of-persons program appears to stem from divers factors. The program enjoys a high prestige, both at home and abroad, and is therefore able to attract a voluntary participation of leading citizens. It is nonpolitical and nonpropagandistic in character so that it is acceptable in all parts of the non-Communist world. More than any other part of the program, exchanges are a two-way undertaking to stimulate foreign participation. Exchanges often are, and may become, prominent in government, business, and professions, and their potential impact on the attitude toward this country is considerable.

A special study mission of the House of Representatives, with Congressman WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, as chairman, visited southeast Asia and the Pacific, and reported in January 1954:

The exchange program has already demonstrated its value. The committee recommends that the program not only be continued but that it be expanded. The exchange-of-persons program represents one of the most successful efforts to infuse local leaders with American ideals and ideas. Its contraction would be a serious setback to American prestige and American influence.

I would like to repeat here the statement made by Gilbert White, president of Haverford College, of Haverford, Pa., when he testified before the Appropriations Committee. I think the reaction which he had to possible cuts in the appropriation are valid and should give us concern. Mr. White, who appeared on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, said:

1. Experience with such exchange shows that if it is properly carried out it is fundamentally sound in promoting understanding in both directions of movement. American students and faculty gain deeper insight into the problems of foreign countries and see themselves in a fresh light. The visitors come to understand American goals and methods. Warm bonds of friendship are created. Because the programs are highly selective, a large proportion of the people involved are ones who later assume leadership in their home communities.

2. Experience also shows that such exchange if not properly carried out may heighten international tensions and promote misunderstanding. If the selection is casual, if the financial arrangements are incomplete, if new arrivals are not adequately prepared for American ways, if the visitors are either neglected or displayed unduly, if they are placed in the wrong institutions, the effects will be unhappy. It is a great mistake to think that any kind of international exchange of persons is good. It can lead to personal disappointment, to hard feelings and resentment. It can strengthen distrust and feed envy. There is absolutely no doubt about this. This leads to my third and last point.

3. It would be better for the United States not to sponsor any kind of program than to do so in a grudging, halfhearted, and penurious way. For many visitors who come to this country the trip is the great event of their lives to that point. For all of them the decision to come is a momentous one, often years in the making. They can sense immediately whether the reception is warm and adequate. They need stay only a few weeks before discovering whether genuine thought and consideration is going into preparations for them. Mechanical treat-

ment will not do. It is necessary and deep in the American tradition to treat people as individuals.

The answer would seem to be to assure that each person involved in an exchange program is treated as an individual. If we are to obtain the benefits so often claimed, we must show in practice a genuine loving consideration for each person who is treated as someone with distinctive needs to meet and with distinctive help to offer his associates. This requires competent administrative help all the way along the line from the time the first announcement is sent out until the person returns to his home country.

This is a simple lesson learned wherever education—under Friends' auspices or not—concerns itself with individual development.

From some familiarity with the present United States program, it would seem that it is approaching this kind of effort at many points and that it is on a reasonable scale of expenditure for the objects intended. It does not border on the luxurious. Friends have felt strongly that the program should be expanded in the interest of building international good will. If cuts must be made in the long run, they should be made gradually in such a fashion as to preserve the concern for individual people. It would be better to eliminate gestures in this direction entirely than to maintain ones that are empty of friendship and human concern.

Let me say that I support the sentiments of Mr. White. The President has spoken favorably of the program as a great force for world peace. Our Ambassadors endorse it. Newspaper correspondents abroad write in glowing words of praise for it. It does not seem timely for this body to cripple a program that is a positive force for world peace and understanding among nations. I urge, as strongly as I am able, that we continue the program to carry out our goals in international affairs. If we want others to see us as a peace-loving nation, we must first provide the opportunity for them to see us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, because I feel that this drastic cut from \$18,700,000 to \$12 million will hamstring the whole program. I would even favor the President's recommendation of \$22 million, but inasmuch as this amendment is before us for \$18 million, I favor it.

First of all, it is my firm conviction that a good county agent in the fields of Iran or the Dominican Republic or any other foreign country is as much protection to this country and as great contribution to the peace of the world as a battleship in the harbor. I know what these county agents and these teachers in foreign countries are doing. I know how the people love them. They have walked into the hearts of the common people. They are counteracting the impressions that our movies and our cheap literature have made upon the people of the world. Those men and women are good men and women. They are humble men and women. They are not arrogant. They are beloved by those people.

In the second place, I believe we should continue to bring the foreign leaders here. They go away with warmth in their hearts for our hospitality. They go away to counteract all of the false propaganda of the Communists,

because they can see what America is. They can see what liberty will do. They can see what it means to give a farmer some incentive, rather than the system of the Soviet Union.

I have toured with dozens of these groups as the representative of our institution. I know the good that it is doing. It is good to the leadership of those countries. Let us not strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed to hear this afternoon that despite the \$60 billion we have spent on foreign countries since the end of World War II, and despite the millions that have been spent upon the student exchange program we are the least understood country in the world. Something apparently is sadly amiss in the handing out of our money throughout the world and with this so-called educational program.

I am opposed to the amendment that has been offered to increase this item and I am opposed to this appropriation bill as it relates to the State Department and to the United Nations.

We have appropriated millions of dollars to the United Nations since its organization in 1945, yet today we find the organization so impotent that it cannot secure the release of the 11 American flyers held in Red China. More than 3 months, well above 3 months, have passed by since a mission was sent to China to obtain the release of the 11 American prisoners of war, yet they are still rotting in Chinese jails. An organization so impotent as that ought to have been given a reduction in the appropriation on the part of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROONEY yielded 2 minutes of his time to Mr. COUDERT).

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the debate on this subject. I have sometimes wondered if we have been losing sight of the essential question before us.

No one is trying to destroy this activity; the committee is not trying to hamper this activity; there is no question of drastic curtailment or cutting. The sympathy of this committee is wholly with this activity, and for years this subcommittee has appropriated or recommended appropriation of funds for it. So let us have the facts before us.

The facts are that in the current fiscal year \$15 million was appropriated for this activity exclusive of transfers. For the next fiscal year for which we are now appropriating \$22 million—an increase of \$7 million—was requested. In reducing the amount to \$12 million the committee was very mindful of the fact that this bill must ultimately clear another body which has an almost irresistible predilection for increasing the amounts carried in House bills. This item happens to be one of the favorites of our friends on the other side of the Capitol. It is perfectly certain that any amount that appears in the bill as it leaves this

House will be substantially increased on the other side.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, No. 1: That the \$12 million carried in this bill if it stands will, in fact, represent \$15 to \$16 and perhaps even \$18 million ultimately.

No. 2: In supporting the subcommittee action personally I have done so with the greatest sympathy for the program; I believe in it. Other members of the committee believe in it. There were some members of the subcommittee who thought it should be less, some who thought it should be more, but we agreed on the amount in the bill. It must be remembered that this is not the only educational exchange program carried on by the Government of the United States at the expense of the American taxpayers. The fact of the matter is that there are 12,000 annual grants in the 1955 budget costing \$156 million, not \$15 million; and of that only 6,000 grants are carried in this particular program. FOA has something like 5,000; the Army has some. You will see the whole picture on page 6.

Now, FOA is about to go out of business. The activities of FOA, are going to be transferred to other Government agencies. Undoubtedly the educational program will go to the State Department, another reason why we should not go too fast in extending and enlarging the program in the State Department.

The amendment now before us would substantially enlarge and increase the amount appropriated for this activity in the coming fiscal year. What the committee is proposing to do would in ultimate effect retain the activity at about present level.

In view of our budget condition, in view of all the circumstances that confront us, the sound, reasonable compromise of all factors involved is represented by the \$12 million in the House bill. I hope, therefore, that the pending amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's position and in opposition to the amendment now pending. I may say that I have a great university in my district. I am also a member of the board of trustees of another great institution of learning. I am deeply concerned about this program and strongly in favor of its objective. However, I hear too often on these various programs the oratory pleading to accomplish these fine things with a failure to recognize the fact that it is not necessary to go to the Federal Government all the time in order to do these things. In fact, these programs, including the student exchange program, have existed a long time before the Federal Government ever decided to move in. The situation is such today that perhaps the Federal Government should have entered this field to a certain degree. The conditions are such that probably the Government should remain in there. The question to be decided now, is the extent to which the Federal Government should and need be in the

program. I sponsored an amendment, which is now law, in connection with the tax revision act of 1954 increasing the amount of deduction for charitable donations to educational, medical, and religious institutions, by 10 percent, having in mind the object to channel some of this endeavor back to private enterprise, to get away from this government-to-government operation. I submit it is the government-to-government operation in these welfare programs that we have indulged in which is causing a great deal of our difficulty so far as our relations abroad are concerned.

If we would only think of the objective of these programs as being fine, and we all do, then get down to the detail of how we can best accomplish these objectives, we would keep our feet more firmly on the ground.

The subcommittee has done a very fine job of analyzing this picture and I think it should be supported. In my opinion, private individuals and agencies are moving more and more into this field of interchange of students. I hope this will continue because it is a worthwhile program, but the results are better accomplished on a people-to-people basis rather than a government-to-government basis. More private funds and less governmental funds should be our objective.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, in many respects I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who just preceded me. I share his desire that these very salutary exchanges between the people of our own country and the nationals of other countries may be financed more and more through private funds rather than through Government subsidies.

It is interesting to note on page 7 of the committee report that in the 1953-54 academic year, there were 33,833 foreign students attending institutions of higher learning in this country, of which only 2,656 were participants in this international exchange program. In other words, approximately 93 percent were financed outside of the Government program.

This is not a new program to our Government. The goodwill the United States of America gained in all of Asia, perhaps in all the world, through the use of the Boxer Rebellion fund for the education of Chinese students in this country has paid dividends down through the years. Exchange teachers, teaching in Europe or some other country, reach hundreds of students abroad as well as faculty colleagues and help spread the free enterprise doctrine upon which our Government and economy are founded.

I think of the Fulbright program as one of the intelligent things we did with our surplus property abroad at the end of World War II. We provided that some of the credits should be used for this educational exchange program. We also provided that some of the proceeds of the sale of our surplus property abroad should be used to acquire real estate for our use. Outside of those two programs, the disposal of surplus property abroad

after World War II was a story of squandering of great magnitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to close debate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the unanimous action of the committee in regard to this item and in opposition to the pending amendment, I should like to assure those present who might think that Congress has been niggardly concerning exchange programs in the past that that is not the fact, because to date for exchange and technical-assistance programs there has been expended between the Department of State, the Department of the Army, and FOA a total of \$348 million. We now find a request for 7,160 grants; 5,423 to bring foreign students to the United States and 1,727 to send United States students abroad. What is so sacrosanct about these figures? Why not, instead of 7,160, make it 5,429? Why not, instead of an exactly and delightfully rounded out \$22 million, should we not make it twelve million and one? After all, when the committee finds a situation where they propose 1,300 foreign students to be taken from their native countries in Europe and at the American taxpayers' expense sent to schools in other foreign countries in Europe, and when it finds that they are bringing people here under this program who have been previously in the United States, 1, 2, 3, and 4 times, why, I think it is time to look very carefully into the situation. Our problem today is communism. Is it so highly important that we have an extensive program in Spain, where there is not the slightest threat of Communist influence? Now, if you talk about doing something in southeast Asia, I might go along with you, but the people running this program, who wanted \$4.1 million to administer a \$22 million program, proposed to send \$9.7 million of the program to Europe and only \$5.3 million to the Far East, Hong Kong, and Pacific Trust Territories. Now, these are indications of the way the whole business is being run. I think it is time we called a halt. I think it is time that Congress took another look-see in regard to spending the taxpayers' money for this expensive program. We are not crippling the program. Every member of the committee has been for this program for years and years, but we believe in taking at least some look-see at Uncle Sam's Treasury and the condition of it today, and that is what this committee meant when it allowed \$12 million, a lot of money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be defeated.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin would restore a part of the money cut by the Appropriations Committee from this important educational exchange program. I support his merito-

rious proposal because I believe that good results come from the interchange of the good-will ambassadors financed by this program.

The gentleman from Georgia tells us that students and teachers who come to this country on the exchange program accomplish much good in giving to people from other nations a better understanding of America and our good intentions.

It is true that we are misunderstood by other peoples, but it is equally true that folks in foreign lands are misunderstood by the American people. American tourists, and particularly those with plenty of money to spend, often give the wrong impression of America. Furthermore, these tourists, who spend comparatively little time in any one place cannot hope to learn much about the people and the things which concern them. American travelers in Europe cannot be expected to accomplish what exchange students and teachers can who go abroad and live with and close to the people.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is just as important that the people of America should know and understand their fellow humans in other lands, as it is for others to know and understand us.

There is much that all mankind holds in common. The desire for peace and happiness, for security and freedom is not only held by those of us whom by fate are privileged to be citizens of the United States. In every normal human being there is the eternal hope for an end to war and for the opportunity to live in tranquility and peace.

No funds are wasted when spent in a sincere effort to build the kind of understanding which can bring closer to man his age-long desire for peace.

The appropriation is small indeed for an essential program such as this. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ZABLOCKI) there were—ayes 38, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rama Road, Nicaragua

For an additional amount for necessary expenses for the survey and construction of the Rama Road, Nicaragua, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 160), as supplemented by section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (Public Law 350, approved May 6, 1954), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That transfer of funds may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Commerce for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Communist Party, in all countries of its operation, has always sought to control trade unions, and to speak for labor, in order that through labor it might communize the world. Look at France and Italy and we see how the Communist Party destroys unity and patriotism through the trade unions which it domi-

nates and controls. The Communist Party in the United States has been no exception. From the earliest days of the American trade-union movement, the United States Communist Party has attempted to infiltrate the labor movement, with a great measure of success.

This Communist infiltration, carried out by members of the United States Communist Party, has been supervised at all times by their Soviet masters, the architects of world communism. When their penetration was neither deep nor swift enough for the Kremlin, new faces replaced the old. In 1929 the governing body of world communism, the Communist International, ordered the United States Communist Party to "widen its agitational and organizational work in the big plants, in the main branches in industry."

However, even with the direction of the Communist International, the success of the Communist Party within the American trade-union movement was slow. After all, the American could not be molded into the conspirator as fast as his European counterpart. The American, even though a member of the Communist Party, felt that the Communist Party was the vehicle to a successful trade-union movement. His masters, however, wanted speed, for they saw the trade-union movement as the means to a successful Communist revolution.

To speed the Communist Party in its task of capturing the trade-union movement of the world, Nikolai Lenin, the father of this godless ideology, spoke:

It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade union, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.

The Communist Parties of the world heeded the advice and the Communist Party of the United States grew strong at the expense of the trade-union movement.

This Congress, through the investigations by the Committee on Un-American Activities, has for nearly 20 years exposed the devices, maneuvers, evasions, and subterfuge on the part of Communists within the trade-union movement. We have seen how Lenin's instructions have turned basically honest, patriotic workers into traitors against the United States while acting as agents for the Soviet Union. We have seen Communists using their trade-union positions to engage in espionage on behalf of Russia. We have seen the unions, which the Communists control, use their membership to brand Franklin D. Roosevelt a warmonger when America's foreign policy was against the policies of Russia. We have seen these same unions condemn Truman for his aid to Greece when America saved that country from communism. We have seen these same unions condemn Eisenhower for America's foreign policy with respect to Germany and Asia.

Not only did the Congress see these devices, maneuvers, evasions, and subterfuge on the part of Communists within the trade-union movement, but so did the American people, the American Fed-

eration of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The American people demanded action, and this Congress enacted legislation to curb the Communist. The CIO expelled from its ranks the unions which the Communists dominated. The A. F. of L., which had prevented wholesale infiltration into its ranks, strengthened its organizations against those who had infiltrated it.

Since these unions were expelled from the CIO in 1950, much has happened to threaten the Communist position within the trade-union movement. The Communist was finding it extremely difficult to continue to follow Lenin's direction to "penetrate the trade union, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs." Since 1950, thousands of workers have repudiated the Communist-dominated unions and their Communist leaders, and returned to patriotic unions affiliated with the CIO and A. F. of L. As these workers and their local unions joined the CIO or A. F. of L., their Communist leaders were eradicated from leadership in the labor movement.

The gradual loss of membership suffered by the Communist-dominated unions, plus the enactment of the Communist Control Act of 1954, faced the Communist labor leaders with the realization that they were slowly reaching the point where they could no longer carry out their Communist work through the trade-union movement. To correct this condition, the labor commission of the Communist Party of the United States established, as the No. 1 objective of all Communists, ways and means to combat this destruction of their dreams of revolution and conquest.

The Communists knew that by their devices and maneuvers they could keep the bulk of their membership in line. They had with success, since 1950, defeated the CIO and A. F. of L. in many of their attempts to capture Communist-dominated locals. Of course, they had to sell the workers that the CIO and A. F. of L. were selling out the worker to Wall Street. Yes, they had to sell the workers on the idea that they could win more advantages for the worker; while, at the same time, hide the deals which they had made with management. But the Communists reasoned that, inasmuch as they had sold this to the workers in the past, there was no reason why they could not in the future.

To digress for one moment while on this point, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the argument we have heard over the past several years, about some companies working in behalf of the Communist-dominated unions, is not false. The committee has under subpoena the vice president of one such company. This company officer, according to documents, advised his supervisory personnel not to encourage employees to vote against the Communist-dominated United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union. Why? Because they had made certain arrangements with the UE which guaranteed 130 percent production and other gains which would financially help the company.

Returning to my original point, the Communist Party was faced with the problem of overcoming the Communist Control Act of 1954 and the forthcoming merger of the A. F. of L. and CIO. As the Communists saw things, the Communist Control Act of 1954, which act, incidentally, was first recommended to the Congress by the Committee on Un-American Activities under the chairmanship of John Wood, of Georgia, would place each of the unions kicked out of the CIO on trial before the Subversive Activities Control Board on the charge that each was a Communist-dominated organization. The Communists knew that the majority of the members of these unions were patriotic Americans, even though gullible, and therefore they would not continue their affiliation in Communist-dominated unions if the Board found them guilty. The Communist Party also knew that, after the merger of the A. F. of L. and CIO, the members of the Communist-dominated unions would demand affiliation with the merged union.

The Communist Party therefore arrived at a decision; a decision which since the early part of 1954 has been the Communist Party line; a decision which is the No. 1 directive of all Communists, whether they be in or outside the trade-union movement. This directive protects the Communist against prosecution under the Communist Control Act of 1954. It defeats the purpose of the act and defeats one of the dreams of the A. F. of L.-CIO merger. The directive is very simple; merge with a union now affiliated with the A. F. of L. or CIO. The Communist dreams are in reality facts. A successful merger would protect the Communist member in his position of leadership of a union, and, at the same time, gain for the Communist-dominated union an exemption from the Communist Control Act of 1954. A successful merger would force upon the A. F. of L. or CIO the decision of either accepting the Communist leaders or expelling the A. F. of L. or CIO union. A merger with a CIO union would repudiate the action of the CIO in 1950 in expelling the union. A merger with an A. F. of L. union places the A. F. of L. in the position of repudiating its insistence that the CIO expel its Communist unions.

With the Communist directive to merge before them, the Communist leaders started their work. Harry Bridges started his campaign. Bridges was even offering to eliminate himself from leadership of his longshoremen if someone would give the other Communists a home. Fitzgerald and Emspak, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, were willing to cut themselves out of any merger. Ben Gold was peddling his fur and leather workers. This is not exactly the fact. More properly, Gold was calling the shots. Abe Feinglass was peddling the deal; a deal which cut out Ben Gold. Of course, this had to be the case, for, after all, Gold had been convicted of perjury, so, therefore, no union would take him as an officer. The Fur and Leather Workers could have waited for the Gold case to go before the Supreme Court on appeal—

but that would take time—and, of course, time they did not have.

Fortunately, for the security of the United States and the welfare of the trade-union movement, most of the merger talk fell on deaf ears. Unfortunately, as of today, there has been an exception. The Fur and Leather Workers Union found a home within the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, A. F. of L. On December 28 of last year, these two unions entered into a marriage. Like the bride's mother, the Communists did not lose their union but, rather as the agreement shows, they gained additional workers employed in the leather trades, which workers were formerly under the Meat Cutters and Butchers.

In January, the Fur and Leather Workers held a convention to ratify the agreement. We see, through the agreement and the convention proceedings, the Lenin directive of over 20 years ago being followed to the hilt. How the Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen permitted this deceit, evasion, and subterfuge to be worked on them, only they know. The Meat Cutters and Butchers have in the past always fought for the security of the United States and against international communism. Maybe they feel they can eliminate the Communists after they have them within their ranks. Only by expulsion could the CIO rid itself of them, and the expulsion followed years of internal strife. Why the Meat Cutters and Butchers subject themselves to the same strife when, after action by the Subversive Activities Control Board, or the A. F. of L.-CIO merger, they could have the workers without their Communist leaders, here again only they can answer.

The merger agreement and the Fur and Leather convention proceedings prove without doubt that the Communist leaders of the Fur and Leather Workers did not enter the agreement with clean hands. These documents prove that the Fur and Leather leaders have not changed. Instead of admitting the acts of former years on behalf of international communism, they insist they never happened. The convention proceedings deal with their disaffiliation by the CIO in 1950. The CIO, in expelling them, found, on the basis of the evidence, "that the policies and activities of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution."

The Fur and Leather convention proceedings claim they left the CIO for its strikebreaking activities in Gloversville, N. Y. This reminds me of the charges leveled against the committee last month when we subpoenaed a few Communist leaders of the UE.

Before the CIO expelled the Fur and Leather Workers, a hearing on the charges was conducted. Ben Gold, president of the Fur and Leather Workers, refused to attend. Instead, he condemned the hearing as a "kangaroo hearing." After hearing and reviewing the evidence, the delegates, by an overwhelming vote, found the Interna-

tional Fur and Leather Workers Union to be subservient to the Communist Party. In spite of this, their convention proceedings state that they proved to the Meat Cutters and Butchers that the charge of Communist domination was slander, and that they were not dominated by any political party.

Let us examine some of the acts of the Fur and Leather Workers Union on which the charges of Communist domination are based.

In 1938, they denounced America's neutral position in Europe, and condemned England and France for appeasing Hitler.

Following the Nazi-Soviet pact of August 22, 1939, they supported Hitlerism and denounced President Roosevelt as a warmonger.

During this same period, they denounced lend-lease as totalitarian and un-American, while calling the Governments of France and England monopolist-dominated governments, and accused these countries of fostering an imperialist war.

On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked Russia. On July 7, 1941, Fur and Leather called for unlimited and immediate aid to Great Britain and the Soviet Union in the fight against Nazi fascism.

Now that the Soviet Union was at war, the Fur and Leather Workers pulled all the stops. They demanded that the United States enter the war. John L. Lewis was denounced as a traitor for his isolationist views. Roosevelt became our greatest President. America's military strategy was not swift enough; they demanded a second front in Europe, quoting authorities such as Molotov, Ben Gold, and Irving Potash.

In December 1943 came Teheran. From then until the war's end, the Fur and Leather Workers found no fault with either the foreign or domestic policies of the United States. But, in October 1945, they demanded that the United States "stop assisting reactionary forces in China and other Pacific countries in their attacks against the rising democratic forces."

Following the war, the Fur and Leather Workers Union followed the Communist line on these issues:

(a) It ridiculed charges of Russian espionage in Canada.

(b) It denounced the Bikini bomb tests as designed to intimidate the Soviet Union.

(c) It accused the United States of fomenting the civil war in China, and denounced the use of American arms against Chinese Communists and other democratic groups.

(d) It opposed the Truman Doctrine from its inception.

(e) It denounced the Marshall plan and described it as "used by big business against both the European workers and the American workers."

(f) It condemned the Atlantic Pact as Wall Street's plan for a third world war.

(g) It supported the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions and opposed the CIO and A. F. of L.-sponsored international Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

(h) It condemned the intervention and participation by the United States

in Korea; and, following the Soviet policy, demanded a cease-fire and withdrawal of American troops.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the publications, public statements, and utterances of Fur and Leather Workers Union, I have been unable to find one statement of disapproval of the foreign or domestic policy of either the Soviet Union or any of its satellite countries. Even in the merger agreement, it does not condemn the Soviet Union, while it pledges unalterable opposition to all who seek to destroy the Government of the United States. However, when it pledges to accomplish its historic objective, namely, a democratic form of government, the Fur and Leather Workers Union could be saying to its Communist masters: "Don't misunderstand. Haven't we in the past called the Governments of Russia, Communist China, and North Korea, as well as the Soviet satellites, 'democracies'? We have not turned on you. We are merely following Lenin's directive to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, evasions, and subterfuge."

The merger agreement also provides that officers, managers, organizers, business agents, representatives, their assistants, and other administrative and staff personnel of the Fur and Leather Workers Union shall be required, as a material condition of holding office or serving in any such capacities or receiving compensation therefor, to execute annually valid individual non-Communist affidavits. This provision must have given the Communist Party its greatest pleasure. Why, the Communist Party has had its members signing such affidavits for years—not mere pieces of paper, worth no more than the paper itself, but, rather, affidavits which subject the individual to perjury conviction if proved false. Through technicalities attached to Communist Party membership and the affidavit requirements, only a few Communist trade unionists have had their illegal acts uncovered. One of these was Ben Gold, the former president of the Fur and Leather Workers. His successor is Abe Feinglass, who heads the Fur and Leather Department under the merger. He becomes a member of the Meat Cutters' and Butchers' executive board. Feinglass is required to sign and, I understand, has signed a non-Communist affidavit. Yet this same Abe Feinglass, 1 year ago this month, refused under oath to deny his affiliation with the Communist Party. He appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities in April 1954 and, when he was asked if he had been a member of the Communist Party, he refused to answer, invoking his privilege under the fifth amendment. While he admitted to having been a candidate for public office in 1935, running on the Communist Party ticket, he would not state whether, either in 1935 or 1954 or at any time in between, he was or was not a Communist. Yet he files with the Meat Cutters' and Butchers' Union a non-Communist affidavit.

Feinglass is not the only Communist officer who will submit this worthless non-Communist affidavit, and who has previously invoked the fifth amendment when questioned under oath about his

Communist affiliation. A score of their officers have invoked their privilege before committees of the House and Senate, on having been identified before committees and other governmental bodies as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know at this point if legislation is needed to protect the American people and the American worker from this latest attack on one of America's free institutions by the Communist Party of the United States. As chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities I intend to find out. On the basis of the evidence in the possession of the committee, I have ordered a full and complete investigation. If necessary, I shall ask the committee to summon before it every leader filing a non-Communist affidavit with the Meat Cutters and Butchers Union, where we have evidence of their one-time affiliation with the Communist Party. We hope, through them, to learn of their activities and the activities of the Fur and Leather Workers in support of communism, past and present, and their plans for the future.

In calling for this investigation, I am confident that I can count on the full support of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen's Union, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and all Americans possessing evidence on this subject.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to draw the attention of the committee to the item of appropriation of \$2 million for the Rama Road in Nicaragua. This is an old boondoggle that has been with us for years and years and years.

May I refer to the statement made by the witness before the committee as it appears on page 418 in the prepared statement in the committee's hearings. I quote as follows:

The Rama Road represents a commitment of this Government which has been partially fulfilled. The agreement by the United States to construct the Rama Road stems from conversations held in 1939 between President Somoza of Nicaragua and President Roosevelt.

And then on page 419 the witness in behalf of this appropriation characterized it this way:

It is an old political commitment made back in 1942.

I wanted to call attention of the House to the way these things get started.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, this is the brainchild of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Of course, that is the fact. But does the gentleman know that in connection with this same matter of highway construction, President Eisenhower has just sent up here to Capitol Hill a supplemental request for \$69 million—that is, for the Inter-American Highway. Maybe there is something to this.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is always aware of these high personalities in the administration, but I am calling attention to this as an original commitment that the Congress never approved, but which was paid out of the President's defense emergency fund in order to mollify President Somoza of Nicaragua who was disappointed that we were not going to build a sea level canal across Nicaragua.

Originally, this thing started out to be a \$2 million highway; 160 miles of it to be built according to Nicaraguan standards. Along came the Public Roads Administration, which thought such a highway was not anything that they would want to be connected with. So they increased the specifications and estimated that the road was going to cost \$4 million. By the time the committee, of which I had the honor to be counsel, investigated this matter in the summer of 1946, Mr. James, of the Public Roads Administration, said that the \$4 million estimate was too low and he thought it was going to cost \$6½ million. Now it costs \$8 million. And the testimony before the committee is that it will not provide a surface for this highway. As soon as they spend the \$8 million, they will be back in here asking to put a bituminous top on this highway that has nothing whatever to do with the Inter-American Highway but runs crossways of Nicaragua to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Escondido River which has a port on the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to correct something I said a while ago. The amount contained in House Document 126 submitted by President Dwight D. Eisenhower under date of April 12, 1955 for the Bureau of Public Roads, Inter-American Highway, was \$69,230,000.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is talking about a completely different road. This Rama Road was not advanced as a part of the Inter-American Highway. It is not a part of the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. ROONEY. The situation is comparable, there is no question about it. The gentleman and the distinguished former member of the other body from the gentleman's State have been misled with regard to this. We have had arguments concerning the Rama Road in every conference on this particular bill, because the gentleman to whom I refer was always a conferee on it.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman to whom the gentleman refers happened to have been on the spot and gotten the facts, on the basis of which the report was made from which I have been quoting to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I regret to advise the gentleman that the other gentleman was never proved right, for no one else in the conference agreed with him.

Mr. MEADER. That does not prove anything.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think I should point out that the gentleman said this is going to be an all-weather road. He is correct. It is an all-weather road that is fully capable of utilization without black-topping. It is a road that the Nicaraguan Government is participating in. They are putting up a considerable part of the money. They are very interested in it, or they could ask that the road be dropped. It is opening a comparatively undeveloped part of their country, and linking the two oceans which border that country.

Mr. MEADER. There are plenty of roads around the world that we could build that would be very useful, but I think when we start on that kind of a proposition we do not know where to stop.

May I ask the gentleman, When they come back and ask for the black-topping of the road, are you on the Appropriations Committee going to grant such a request?

Mr. SIKES. It is not going to be necessary to black-top this road for it to be usable in all types of weather for all types of traffic. It would be desirable to have it black-topped at some time in the future, but that is not essential to achieve the purpose for which it was set up and which those people want and need very much. We are performing a good-neighbor service in enabling them to do this.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, under leave obtained in the House, I am inserting at this point in my remarks comments on this subject made in a 1947 Report of the Senate War Investigating Committee, of which I had the honor to be counsel.

Excerpts from Senate Report No. 440, 80th Congress, 1st session, relating to the Rama Road:

The other important United States road construction during the war in Central America was the Rama Road. This road extends from San Benito on the Inter-American Highway, a short distance north of Managua, Nicaragua, to Rama, a river port on the Escondido River, a distance of 160 miles. The purpose of this highway is to provide an overland route from Rama to the central and western part of Nicaragua, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific coastal sections of Nicaragua.

In 1914, the United States obtained an option to construct a canal across Nicaragua. In 1939, the Army engineers completed a survey and located a proposed canal. The estimated cost of such a canal, however, was very high and construction was not recommended. President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, obtained from President Roosevelt an agreement to build the Rama Road instead of a canal. The original estimated cost of this highway, to be built to Nicaraguan highway standards, was \$2 million. However, the Public Roads Administration recommended that higher construction standards be used in order to provide a road less susceptible to erosion, estimated the cost of such a road at \$4 million. Construction standards similar to those of the Inter-American Highway, with the exception of width, were adopted. The Rama Road was to be surfaced to a 5-meter width rather than 6 meters.

Rama is a river port. Up to this point, the Escondido River Channel is at least 30 feet deep, a sufficient draft for large ocean-going vessels. However, a bar at the mouth

of the river, where the depth is only 12 feet, now blocks its navigation by oceangoing vessels.

Mr. E. W. James of the Public Roads Administration testified that about \$3 million had been spent on this highway, and that the \$4 million estimate to complete the work was no longer accurate, as it was now thought that total construction would cost approximately \$6,500,000.

The funds for the Rama Road were taken from the secret or emergency fund of the President, thereby avoiding the need for approval by, or accounting to, the Congress. Although Congress has never had an opportunity to debate the merits of the Rama Road, nor even knew about it until this committee's investigation, State Department representatives take the position that the United States is committed to complete this road regardless of how high its cost may mount.

The committee does not consider either of these expenditures of United States funds sufficiently related to national defense as to justify them as proper defense expenditures in World War II. Furthermore, with respect to the Rama Road, the use of funds from the secret or emergency fund of the President, an appropriation available only for emergencies affecting the national security or defense, appears questionable.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, \$3,100,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the Justice Department appropriation bill earlier in the day reference was made by the gentleman from New York to the failure of the Justice Department to prosecute Judith Coplon and William Z. Foster.

The situation with regard to Judith Coplon was made quite clear during the debate last year on the so-called wire-tapping bill, which was designed to permit the use in court of evidence obtained by tapping wires. The bill that was urged upon the Congress by the Attorney General and brought before the House would have permitted the use in court of any evidence obtained by intercepting communications, provided that had been done upon express written authority of the Attorney General, as was the case with the evidence obtained relating to Judith Coplon. The bill was amended here on the floor. The bill which went from this side to the other body provided for the use in court of wiretap evidence obtained up to date upon the written authority of the Attorney General, but hereafter required a court order in order to use that evidence in court. It met with a dire fate in the other body and was buried in the Committee on the Judiciary there I believe by an even vote of 7 to 7 or some such vote as that. If that legislation had been enacted, which was urged by the Attorney General upon the Congress, it would have resulted in the Attorney General being in a position to successfully prosecute this defendant for whom none of us hold any brief. It is significant that she was not prosecuted under the preceding administration and probably—and I am not critical of them—for

the same reasons. But, it does not lie with those, particularly any who may have opposed this wiretap legislation to make it possible to successfully maintain such a prosecution, to be critical now of the present Attorney General for his failure to proceed with that prosecution.

The same thing applies to William Z. Foster who is a well-known Communist figure in this country and who has been indicted and is now awaiting trial. The Attorney General has moved on several occasions to bring him to trial and each time the defendant's attorney has come in with medical affidavits as a result of which the court has decreed he shall not now be brought to trial.

I think in order to set this record straight with regard to the administration of the office of the Department of Justice, which has been so diligent in bringing to book these enemies of our country, it is important to have in the Record at this point some explanation of the reason why these two cases have not been brought to trial.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss briefly a matter of great concern to the people of the Western Hemisphere.

It is significant that on Pan-American Day the Congress is giving consideration to the President's request that sufficient funds to complete the Inter-American Highway in the next 3 years be provided. His request merits prompt and favorable action.

I know much of Central America first hand and have in recent years traveled over portions of the highway. I have seen the positive economic benefits that already resulted in those areas in which the highway now exists, and it takes little imagination to realize the future economic progress and social betterment which will come with the completion of an all-weather Inter-American Highway from the southern border of the United States to the Panama Canal.

Economically, the highway will serve first of all as a stimulus for trade both between the nations of Central America and between the United States and each of those nations. We have great economic ties with the countries of Central America which have long been prime markets for our exports and important suppliers of our imports. This trade can be expected to increase with the completion of the highway. Annual exports from the United States to this area have already increased many times since the highway was first started. A fully completed highway would give even greater impetus to our trade relations.

Second, economic effect of the highway would be in the economic development field. Our policy has been to urge the countries of Central America to attain the greatest degree of economic development. We do this not only for purely altruistic reasons. We do it also because it is as much in our interest as it is in their interest to develop economically. One of the main factors which has thus far limited and retarded economic development, however, has been the lack of adequate surface trans-

portation. There can be no doubt that completing an all-weather highway in Central America will foster economic growth in the area, and increase the opportunities for free trade and new markets.

Still a third economic benefit which will accrue from completion of the highway is an increase in tourism. As many of the Members of this House know from their own visits to the area, Central America is a wonderland for tourism, which is still virtually unknown because of inadequate surface transportation facilities. I have a daughter who lived in San Jose, Costa Rica, for several years, and I have visited that charming city. Costa Rica is a land of eternal spring and startling beauty. It is close by. Its people and government are friendly. Yet, because it can only be reached now by boat or plane from the United States, this wonderful country is known to only a handful of our citizens. A tourist trade in Central America would contribute a great deal to the economic betterment. It would also mean, and I think this is equally important, that the peoples of the area would get to know our people better and be less inclined to listen to the falsehoods of Communist agitators. At the same time we would get to know better the people of the area who could more easily travel to the United States. The importance of the strong cultural and spiritual ties which would result from this interchange cannot be exaggerated.

I have spoken at length of the mutual economic benefits which are to be anticipated from the completion of the highway. They are not the only factors which we should consider when we approve the President's request for its speedy completion.

Political considerations are present too. Only a short time ago we saw how international communism, by capitalizing on misinformation and the physical isolation of the people of Guatemala, succeeded in dominating the political institutions of that Republic and establishing a beachhead for international tyranny. Fortunately the people of Guatemala, through courage and determination, were able to throw out the false leaders who had delivered their country to communism and reassert the independence of this Republic.

But the fact that communism has been repulsed does not mean that new attempts will not be made. We know that international communism nourishes itself by conquering free peoples. And we must make every effort to see that it never again becomes rooted in this hemisphere. The completion of the highway would serve as a deterrent to Communist infiltration because it would contribute positively to the political stability of the area. Such political stability would also greatly increase the growing influence which these Central American countries and the other republics of this hemisphere are constantly bringing to bear in world affairs.

Still another factor which cannot be overlooked, when we discuss the completion of the Inter-American Highway, are the strategic benefits which we may anticipate. A great number of the strategic materials which our country

needs if it is to fulfill its role as defender of the free world, come from areas which will be served by this highway. Many of these countries have concluded special military agreements with the United States for defense of the hemisphere. As a result defense sites have been developed. These sites, of considerable strategic consequence to our country, will be linked by the highway.

Our country has, for many years, made large expenditures for this highway. The countries of Central America through which the highway passes have also made considerable sums available. But if we and our neighbors are to enjoy the maximum returns for our contribution—in terms of economic progress and political stability—it is essential that the President's proposal for completion of the highway within 3 years be acted on favorably. The sums involved, unlike those of many requests which reach this House, are small. The returns to be expected by us and our friends in Central America are predictable. The time for action is now.

(The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.)

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, and the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1431 et seq.), to carry out international information activities, including employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$6,000); entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$1,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by the law of such countries; purchase of space in publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 44 United States Code 322; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; purchase of caps for personnel employed abroad; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad; purchase of ice and drinking water abroad; payment of excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is

assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script-writing translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding 5 years of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$80,500,000, of which not less than \$8 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$35,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current year: *Provided further*, That funds may be exchanged for payment of expenses in connection with the operation of information establishments abroad without regard to the provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543): *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles used abroad exclusively for the purposes of this appropriation may be exchanged or sold, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance of each such replacement, except buses and station wagons, shall not exceed \$1,400: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the United States Information Agency is authorized in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve for the purposes of foreign information and educational activities which expire during the current fiscal year may be extended for a period of 1 year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment otherwise authorized: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the ceiling of \$3 million which the committee report recommends for the Motion Picture Service is dangerously low. The

Motion Picture Service is operating at a level of about \$3,087,000 for the current fiscal year, and had requested \$4,484,000 for fiscal year 1956. Most of the increase requested for the Motion Picture Service was for the support of this program in the danger areas of the Near East and Far East.

I believe that there is general agreement that in these two critical areas of the world, where there is a high degree of illiteracy, the motion picture is the most effective medium that can possibly be used to support the foreign policy objectives of our country. It seems to me that there is a high degree of risk in limiting arbitrarily this important service in these danger spots where the United States is doing all in its power in other respects to hold back the red tide of communism and to support the governments and peoples who stand with us in Asia and the Near East.

The committee was shown a single powerful Soviet film which was made at an estimated expense of \$750,000 to \$1 million, and we know that the total amount the Soviets are spending for propaganda motion pictures, attacking the United States and our allies, is very large. In the face of the large-scale effort by the enemy, it seems highly questionable for us to curtail our own efforts in this field.

I therefore strongly object to the recommended limitation of \$3 million for the USIA Motion Picture Service.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: On page 35, line 14, strike out "Provided" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$350,000 shall be used for the establishment of a nonprofit book corporation to provide facilities for the translation and publication of books and other printed matter in the various foreign languages: *Provided further.*"

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that this amendment would be accepted by the Committee.

All that this amendment seeks to do is to make available to the peoples of the world the classics of American democracy that were the inspiration of our forefathers and have been an inspiration in our own lives.

I think we have a great deal that is unnecessary in the way of frills in our present program. This is no frill. This simply provides that there shall be printed from selected books or classics, the Federalist and books on which we can all agree, in cheap editions, paper bound, and placed on sale in native languages in all lands of the world. It is the only practical way to win the hearts and minds of people. Our own hearts and our own minds were won for American democracy by reading these classics. These are not books of controversy. Books that are being written today may be, some of them, but these are not. These are the gospels of what we believe as a free people.

I hope that the Committee will accept this amendment and that the point of order will not be raised. It may be if the Committee accepts it and it goes to conference, then the conference may decide to put it in a little different way, but I am just hoping the chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It occurred to me to ask the gentleman whether there had been at any time an appropriation such as the gentleman has suggested. I am very much moved by his argument in behalf of the amendment. I am simply inquiring whether there has been a precedent for this type of work.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not know of any similar program. I was surprised to learn that our classics of American democracy were still so unavailable to the people of the world.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order. There is no authority in law for the appropriation, and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] offers an amendment which the Clerk has reported, against which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] makes a point of order on the ground that it is not authorized by law. Can the gentleman from Illinois, the author of the amendment, cite to the Chair any authority in law for this appropriation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am embarrassed by replying that I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's reply.

Obviously, the amendment is not in order. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and that I may include in the remarks I made on the bill, extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of ascertaining the program for next week, which I understand is now ready.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday, the Consent Calendar.

On Tuesday, the Private Calendar; House Resolution 174, to amend the rules, to increase pay of witnesses; and H. R. 2225, concerning certificates of public convenience under the Civil Aeronautics Act.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, H. R. 4393, construction of naval vessels; H. R. 4644, the postal pay raise bill; House Joint Resolution 256, the Mutual Health Study Act of 1955.

I know of no conference reports at this time, but any conference reports may be brought up at any time, and I make the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR DR. JONAS SALK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 277 authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to have struck and presented to Dr. Jonas Salk a gold medal, in honor of his contribution to mankind, through the successful development of his polio vaccine.

Through this resolution, I believe I am voicing the gratitude of all America. This medal of honor would be a fitting expression of the thankfulness of the people of this Nation to this great doctor and humanitarian for his brilliant achievement.

Dr. Salk's antipolio vaccine was revealed on April 12 as an effective weapon against that terrible disease. In 1954, the vaccine was administered to children in 44 States and in the intervening months the results of the test have been evaluated.

When I first heard the news of the proved effectiveness of the vaccine, I recalled the grief-stricken faces of the mothers of those children afflicted with the poliomyelitis, the strained movements of their tortured little bodies, and the accompanying pain. With this great discovery of Dr. Salk's, I could foresee such suffering reduced to a very minimum. Now, there is optimism and hope for the millions of parents of small children. It seemed to me that such a man deserved official recognition from the Congress of the United States. For these reasons I have introduced my bill. I believe that my feelings are shared by all my colleagues and that this legislation will be speedily approved.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for appropriate reference, calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a gold medal for presentation to Dr. Jonas E. Salk. I need not repeat here the details of the monumental discovery which Dr. Salk has made. We have all read with unbounded rejoicing and thanks of the marvelous effects of Dr. Salk's vaccination for poliomyelitis.

The contribution which Dr. Salk has made to the well-being of mankind is infinite. In this hydrogen age, his discovery of principal benefit to our little children is all the more welcome and appropriate, coming as it does from the long and arduous work made possible

by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. It clearly emblazons for all the world to see, that we in the United States, with our freedom and enterprise, are seeking the ways and means to preserve and save lives.

It is most fitting that the thrilling announcement of Dr. Salk's success was made on April 12. On that day 10 years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt died. It was President Roosevelt who showed us the way and led us through the dark night of war. It was his foresight, courage, and determination which has also led us to this dawn of a new era in medical history.

There is little that we can do to express our thankfulness and joy at Dr. Salk's discovery. He has given it to mankind. I am sure that you will all join with me and that we can unanimously approve this bill for Dr. Salk. The recognition of achievements such as his is most fitting. We can do no less than award to him this medal on behalf of his countrymen in grateful appreciation.

AMENDMENT TO WAGE-HOUR LAW

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour, I am pleased that hearings on bills to amend the wage-hour law will begin today by the Senate Labor Committee. A substantial increase in the minimum wage is now long overdue. The last increase, effective in January, 1950, was enacted in 1949 when the country was suffering an economic recession. Congress almost doubled the minimum at that time, raising it by 35 cents, from 40 cents to 75 cents.

Thirty dollars a week is not a living wage in any part of the United States. The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that the average four-person family in the area with the lowest cost of living in the country needs more than twice that amount in order to maintain a modest standard of living. But \$30 a week, 75 cents an hour, is the minimum wage now set by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and thus that is the incredible sum which, for example, thousands of cotton textile mill workers in the southeast region of the United States are paid. What sort of homes, food, clothing, and medical care, can these workers obtain for themselves and their families?

Protection of minimum labor standards is essential at all times in order to assure at least a minimum level of living to low wage workers and their families. It is of strategic importance at the present time that the Nation's statutory minimum wage be raised to a realistic level fully reflecting the increase in the general level of wages. This would give a powerful boost to the purchasing power of low income workers and help

restore prosperity and full employment throughout the economy.

The Nation's ability to produce wealth and distribute it has increased many times since wage and hour legislation was proposed in 1937. This has been due to rising productivity in which labor was a major influence.

The fact that the buying power of wages and salaries generally has failed to rise as rapidly as the economy's increasing man-hour output, is ample justification for the proposed minimum wage of \$1.25. If average wages have lagged behind the continuous growth of the economy as a whole, then the many factory workers, and especially those unorganized white collar and service workers, have seen their spending ability cut in half by the lag in incomes. These workers represent a majority of the American people.

The primary case for the \$1.25 minimum wage is the fact that much of the business community has failed to share the benefits of industrial progress with wage and salary earners. From 1946 through 1952, man-hour output rose 16.3 percent in the private and nongovernment part of the economy. But the buying power of the straight-time average hourly earnings of manufacturing workers increased only 12.8 percent. This fact was due partly to the low-paid workers in unorganized plants which in some cases received the bare minimum wage of 75 cents per hour.

The buying power of wages and salaries must not merely catch up with the past productivity increases; it must forge ahead, if the growth of the economy is not to be distorted by imbalanced incomes and inadequate consumer buying power.

Industry can take in stride a substantial increase in the minimum wage if it has to. Persuasive evidence to this effect is provided by a new study of what happened when the minimum wage was last increased in 1950. The study by the United States Department of Labor finds that there were practically no plant shutdowns or worker layoffs as a result.

Both economic justice and economic wisdom require an immediate increase in the Federal minimum to at least \$1.25 an hour. This would do no more than bring the objectives of our minimum wage legislation up to date. American industry will have no more difficulty adjusting to this change than it had to the 40 cents minimum in 1938 and the 75 cents minimum in 1949.

The policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act is to correct and, as practicable, to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and the general well-being of workers. A higher minimum wage is certainly necessary if the stated purpose of this law is to be carried out. A wider coverage of workers is also necessary, not only for the personal good of the worker, but for the good of the economy and the country as a whole.

Certainly the workers of America—the most prosperous country in the

world—are entitled to a reasonable share of the products of their labor.

The growth of America has not been due to the efforts of any one factor in the country, be it business, government or labor. Rather, this growth has been due to concerted efforts on the part of good government, good business, and good labor. Since all have shared in the building of this great country then it is certainly fair that all should share in the fruits of these concerted efforts.

Ahead lies the task of strengthening minimum wage administration, a task in which the fair-minded people of this country must provide leadership. It is imperative that effective action be taken to maintain the full force of protection of minimum labor standards and to obtain changes necessary to give these programs genuine effectiveness. We should amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for a realistic upward revision of the minimum rate above the current 75 cents to the \$1.25 level, and to extend the protection of the law to the largest possible number of workers.

The very people who oppose an increase in the minimum wage are the ones who expect these poorly paid Americans to be their customers. It does not make even business sense. A higher minimum wage would serve as a prop to our economy, helping to maintain purchasing power upon which all business depends. It is no good to have customers in name only without means to buy the products they want and need.

Greater still than the economic justification for the proposed \$1.25 minimum wage is the justification based on human decency, humanitarian appeals, and concepts of consideration for the welfare of one's fellow man. This Nation throughout its history has been dedicated to these principles.

We can expect the usual statement in opposition: Such legislation would "cause mass unemployment," "interfere with free enterprise and collective bargaining," and "discriminate against small business." However, as stated before, events since the 1938 act and 1949 amendments amply disprove these claims.

Thirty dollars a week today is an insult to any American, even to the organized industrial workers who rightfully enjoy an average pay that is double the minimum. For there is always the danger, in time of adjustment, that the hard-won victories of organized labor may be imperiled by the downpull of these low minimum wages.

Most American enterprises are conducted by men and women who know and live up to the obligation they owe to their employees.

Apart from these are the few exploiters who manufacture misery and drive a wedge between employer and employee that threatens the teamwork upon which our progress depends.

Many Members of Congress and other citizens have registered keen disappointment with the recommendation by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message that the minimum wage be increased to only 90 cents per hour. I feel that this small increase is entirely inadequate to meet the needs of millions of

American workers and their families and to meet the needs of the national economy.

In the interest of justice and fair play, it is the responsibility of Congress to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and to provide for enforcement, because there is no room in the United States for those who profit from the underpayment of those who produce for them.

ONE - HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. EMILIO NUÑEZ

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the celebration of Pan American Day, I believe it appropriate to remind my colleagues that this year is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Emilio Nuñez, one of the principal leaders of the Cuban movement of independence. General Nuñez' ties with the United States were particularly close, since it was he who was in charge of gathering together in the United States the expeditionary forces and the munitions which were sent to reinforce the Cuban forces in the revolution of 1895.

General Nuñez was born in Las Villas Province in Cuba on December 27, 1855. He distinguished himself as an officer in the abortive 10 years' war between 1868 and 1878, when Cuba made its first major attempt to throw off the Spanish yoke. His brother was killed in action during this period and General Nuñez swore to fight against Spanish tyranny until his country should be free.

Although the revolution ended in 1878 with the Pact of Zanjón, General Nuñez and a dedicated group of followers revolted again against the Spanish Government the following year and continued to hold out until, on instructions from the revolutionary junta in New York, headed by Cuba's illustrious José Martí, he was forced to capitulate. By the terms of this capitulation, he agreed to go into exile in the United States, along with the principal leaders of his revolutionary forces.

He took up residence in Philadelphia, where he entered the tobacco trade and studied dentistry in the University of Pennsylvania, where he obtained the degree of doctor of dentistry. Here he married the distinguished Cuban lady, Dolores Portuondo y Blez, whose family, like him, was in exile in the United States.

In 1884 he returned to Cuba as a sailor on an American ship in order to see his family briefly before returning to the United States on the same vessel; he was taken ashore by the Spaniards, imprisoned and later tried for conspiracy. As a result of this trial, he was again exiled to the United States in 1885. In Philadelphia and New York he maintained contact with the principal leaders

of the Cuban independence movement in exile, including José Martí.

When the war of independence commenced in Cuba in 1895, General Nuñez was put in charge of the Department of Expeditions of the Council of Government of Cuban Exiles Abroad. In this capacity he tirelessly strove to gather together and transport to Cuba men and munitions to reinforce the revolutionaries. Because of the United States neutrality laws and the efforts of representatives of the Spanish Government to prevent revolutionary preparations in the United States, this was no mean task. In spite of these deterrents, General Nuñez managed to equip and dispatch many shiploads of arms and men to his compatriots in Cuba. His accomplishments in this regard played a significant role in assuring the success of the revolutionary movement.

After the war ended in 1898, and until his death in 1922, General Nuñez made significant contributions to the peacetime life of his country. He was elected a delegate to the Constituent Assembly in 1901, and in the same year was also elected Governor of Habana, a position which he held until 1908. He became one of the most active leaders of the Conservative Party, and served as Secretary of Agriculture and finally as Vice President between 1916 and 1921. His son, Ambassador Emilio Nuñez Portuondo, who is Cuba's chief delegate to the United Nations, has carried on the fine tradition of public service exemplified by the career of the elder Nuñez, distinguishing himself by the great contribution he has made to the cause of the free world.

It is believed that this brief résumé of General Nuñez' service to the cause of Cuban independence, which was so intimately tied up with our own fight against Spain, should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in this memorable year of the 100th anniversary of his birth.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, today the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the independent Federal agency responsible for the conduct of scientific research in aeronautics, is quietly observing its 40th anniversary. Its 17 members, appointed by the President and serving without pay, act as a board of directors, establishing policy and providing guidance for the paid staff of 7,500 scientists and supporting personnel at the NACA's laboratories.

As one who for almost 20 years has enjoyed a ringside seat from which I could watch the workings of this little-known Government agency, I should like to take this opportunity to express my good wishes to an organization composed of scientists and other workers dedicated

to the task of providing the fundamental information so largely responsible for performance improvement of our airplanes and missiles.

In 1937 when I was a freshman Member, the United States was preeminent, as now, in the world of aeronautics. The late Dr. Joseph S. Ames was Chairman of the NACA at the time. He had been one of the original members appointed to the Committee by President Wilson; he was internationally respected as a teacher and as president of Johns Hopkins University.

In 1937, the NACA was concerned, and very properly, with the very determined effort being made across the Atlantic, especially in Nazi Germany, to overtake us in aeronautics. As Dr. Ames put it at the time, this action constituted "a scientific challenge to America's present leadership."

The Congress, I am proud to say, took necessary action to increase the level of aeronautical research activity in the United States so that our leadership in the skies could continue. In 1939 funds were appropriated to enable modernization and expansion of the NACA's Langley Aeronautical Laboratory. In addition, a new aeronautical laboratory was authorized for the NACA, on the west coast. As a result of this farsighted action, the NACA was performing useful research at what is now known as the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory at Moffett Field, Calif., and on an accelerated basis at Langley, prior to Pearl Harbor.

In 1940, a third forward step was taken, when the Congress authorized construction of a powerplants laboratory, action which resulted in the building of the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland.

The war years for NACA were a period of especial urgency. The scientists had to change their research programs from investigations of fundamental matters to specialized research to bring about immediate improvement in military aircraft already designed. Fortunately, work accomplished by the NACA over the previous 20 years had resulted in a large backlog of data awaiting application.

Of this period, the late Frank Knox, at the time Secretary of the Navy, said:

The Navy's famous fighters—the Corsair, Wildcat, and Hellcat—are possible only because they were based on fundamentals developed by the NACA. All of them use NACA wing sections, NACA cooling methods, NACA high-lift devices. The great sea victories that have broken Japan's expanding grip in the Pacific would not have been possible without the contributions of the NACA.

Unfortunately, V-E Day and V-J Day did not result in a return to the days when the threat of aggression no longer existed. To the contrary, it became imperative for the United States to increase its efforts to remain first in the air. And because the years of World War II had resulted in the consumption of most of the basic research information previously accumulated, the NACA had to expand further its efforts, beyond even the wartime growth.

I have made it my business to visit the NACA laboratories—Langley in Virginia, Ames in California, and Lewis in Ohio—to see for myself what is being done, and

what needs to be done. I have counseled with Dr. Vannevar Bush, who was Chairman of the NACA from 1939 to 1941, and with Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, who has been NACA Chairman since 1941, about the equipment needs of the NACA, and about the necessity for further increases in the drive for information which can be used to build supersonic aircraft that will fly even faster than the best we have today, and to construct guided missiles that will be even more efficient, over longer ranges, than the ones we are now designing.

I am well acquainted with Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director of the NACA, the man who is the operating head of the agency. He is internationally known for his work as an aeronautical scientist. Among scientists he is recognized as a man of rare ability; the Nation is fortunate to have men of his caliber carrying such great responsibilities.

None of us question how vital it is for the United States to maintain, and extend, its aeronautical leadership. We can gain comfort from the fact that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is doing its work so well.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE DIFFERENCES AND COURTESIES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regret that earlier in the day there was a misunderstanding on my part with a great and beloved Member of this House, a gentleman who has always been kindness itself. When I came here as a freshman in the 81st Congress no one could have welcomed me more warmly. I am so very much indebted to him for the many helpful services he rendered me and for the inspiration he has always been to me.

Today, when there was a limited amount of time, and I was not a member of the Appropriations Committee, and it was impossible for him to give me recognition in general debate, being so engrossed with interest in the particular topic to which I had given some study, I am afraid I may have been misunder-

stood. Certainly any remarks that may have seemed disrespectful did not come from my heart. I know that the fine gentleman from New York intended to extend to me every courtesy and every privilege that he possibly could. It is not in the heart or character of my friend to do anything that is not forthright, generous, considerate, helpful. In my book he is the finest type of manhood, and I am happy to have the opportunity to say so. I am going to love him all the more now that we had a little flash of the Irish between us today. I apologize humbly if my remarks were construed as reflecting upon one I admire and love.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that these remarks now being made should be made by the gentleman from New York rather than the gentleman from Illinois. We have been friends since we first met one another. We have spent many pleasant moments together, both here in the Capitol and elsewhere, and certainly we would not intentionally hurt one another. I surely would never do anything to hurt my friend, a great American, the distinguished and lovable gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. You know, it makes me very happy to hear my friend from Illinois make the remarks he has just made because I know how close he is to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I know the high regard the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

I can assure you I was sitting here when my friend was talking earlier in the day, and I knew that he was disturbed, because knowing the tranquility of his mind, I know that he would not have expressed himself, as temperately as he did on that occasion, unless he was disturbed. I knew, without knowing any of the other facts, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], was in a situation where he could not, during general debate, yield time, but he was protecting the gentleman under the 5-minute rule. Now, it is true that under the 5-minute rule you could be recognized by moving to strike out the last word. On the other hand, the chairman is there with his protecting hands to be extended in case any effort was made to prevent the gentleman from having his time; for example, he could move to close debate, which he certainly would not do. But, over and above everything else, this pleasant exchange is most pleasing to me as majority leader because it symbolizes more powerfully than any other action or any other words of mine good conduct to others and the unity that exists among the Democratic Members of the House.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I feel somewhat guilty about this controversy, and I am glad it ended in this happy vein. For a moment the gentleman from New York absented himself from the Chamber and left me in charge of the time. I was under instructions previously to yield 5 minutes to one Member, and as the gentleman from New York stepped out, two gentlemen, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], came up to me and asked for a small amount of time, unaware of the fact that my chairman was undertaking to yield time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. I granted the time, but I am afraid I put him in a position where he was not able to do what he would like to have done in the premises, and I apologize to the gentleman and my chairman for it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The reason that there is so much love on the Democratic side is the example that is set by our majority leader. I do not think it is possible for one Democrat to remain at odds with another Democrat for over 3 minutes, because when he is disturbed for the moment he looks around and sees that smiling face of JOHN McCORMACK and then he gets up and puts out his hand and shakes the hand of the other fellow. We just live in love and brotherhood here on the Democratic side because of JOHN McCORMACK and the great gentleman from Texas, our beloved Speaker.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 800. An act to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1137. An act to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1139. An act to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1600. An act to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol"; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GARY).

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN).

Mr. DAGUE and include a letter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. WIER) and include an article.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MINSHALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. SCUDDER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MEADER to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE).

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. DEANE), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), on account of illness.

Mr. FLOOD, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

686. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the nomination of certain members of the Civil Air Patrol as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with B. L. Carver, which, when executed by the superintendent, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., will authorize Mr. Carver to provide boat dock

and boat-rental facilities along the shore of Fontana Lake on Tennessee Valley Authority lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service adjacent to Great Smoky Mountains National Park, during a 3-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

688. A letter from the Managing Trustee, Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 15th Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

689. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946," approved August 14, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

690. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the progress and feasibility of toll roads, with particular attention to the possible effects of such toll roads upon the Federal-aid highway programs, including recommendations with respect to Federal participation in toll roads (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

691. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

692. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Acadia Corp., authorizing them to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within Acadia National Park, Maine, during a 20-year period from January 1, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with the Avondale Farms, authorizing them to deliver fresh milk to the Chimneys campground for the period January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

694. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

695. A letter from the Presidential Adviser on Personnel Management, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. H. R. 4753. A bill to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5550. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 5551. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Buggs Island Park Authorities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5552. A bill to amend section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that policies of insurance issued under that section on the 5-year level premium term plan may be exchanged for or converted to insurance on any other plan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 5553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5554. A bill to provide that the holder of a mining claim in Alaska may deposit \$100 each year, to be used for the construction of mine access roads, in lieu of performing the assessment work otherwise required on such claim; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 5555. A bill to amend section 302 (b) of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to provide for payment of adjusted compensation in certain cases involving correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5556. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5557. A bill to amend section 542 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of a personal holding company; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5558. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5559. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5560. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5561. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5562. A bill to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 5563. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws

to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 5564. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1888, entitled "Aid to State or Territorial homes" (title 24, sec. 134, U. S. C., as amended); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARY (by request):

H. R. 5565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, effective for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1955, to provide a deduction from gross income for depreciation of buildings owned by all classes of Federal income-tax payers engaged in a trade or business, originally acquired for demolition purposes but subsequently used or rented for a period of more than 6 months in one or more taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5566. A bill to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 5567. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 5568. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to establish more clearly the policy of Congress as to expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 5569. A bill to repeal those provisions of law which exclude from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, spouse, or parent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 5570. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5571. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5572. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 5573. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on the Iowa River, Iowa and Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5574. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5575. A bill for the relief of members of the Armed Forces in respect to the payment of income taxes while held as prisoners by Communist authorities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 5576. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 5577. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5578. A bill to amend paragraph 207 and schedule 16 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 5579. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for direct popular election of the President and Vice President, in place of the electoral college system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution tendering the thanks of the Congress to Dr. Jonas E. Salk for his discovery of an effective weapon against poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 206. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. Res. 207. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. FOST: Senate joint memorial No. 5, Idaho State Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact an excise tax on imports of wool, lead, and zinc, as well as other products, metals, and minerals with similar problems which may be suspended whenever prices are at an economic level that will permit the domestic mining and woolgrowing industries to maintain an adequate mobilization base for national security;

To remove the authority of the executive department to act on the Tariff Commission's recommendations, and to place such responsibility for approving or disapproving such recommendations in the hands of Congress where the constitutional authority rests;

To allow the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as extended, to expire on June 12, 1955; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Senate concurrent resolution No. 45 of the State of New York, memorializing Congress relative to a revision of the defense manpower policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 5581. A bill to convey jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the

claims of Kate Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5582. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 5583. A bill for the relief of Lorna Isabel Azevedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 5584. A bill for the relief of Louis Mavros (also known as Elias Mavrodontis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5586. A bill for the relief of Otto B. Hauße; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5587. A bill for the relief of Murrell C. Prescott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 5588. A bill for the relief of Lorenza Castro-Carmona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 5589. A bill for the relief of Louis F. Cremers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 5590. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5591. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5592. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Leason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 5593. A bill for the relief of Koa Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. Res. 208. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5543 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

199. Mr. CANFIELD presented resolutions of the New Jersey Lumbermen's Association passed at the annual session in Atlantic City on March 23, 1955, concerning retail exemption under the fair labor laws and on extension of title 1, FHA, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address Delivered by Senator Neuberger Before the City Club of Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during the recent trip of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Pacific Northwest for hearings on S. 1333, to authorize Federal construction of Hells Canyon high dam, I had occasion to address the City Club of Portland on April 8, 1955. This is an organization known throughout my home State for its conscientious and thorough approach to public affairs. The City Club has gained national fame for its painstaking research into critical public problems. For example, its study of corrupt-practices laws and election expenditures now is winning the study and approval of political scientists and governmental officials throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks to the City Club in Portland on April 8 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, TO CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND, OREG., APRIL 8, 1955

CONGRESS FACES A CRISIS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

In the 3 months that I have served in the Senate, many important matters have come before the Congress. The list would be well known to you. It includes the most important of all, our foreign policy, and urgent domestic needs such as schools, highways, resource development, adequate pay for Federal and postal workers, and taxation. I shall return to some of these later. But I want to stress first what I believe to be the most critical problem now plaguing our

domestic economy: the continued decline in American farm income.

In recent months, the scope and the dangerous characteristics of our deepening agricultural crisis have been brought to the consciousness of the Congress and of the Nation from many sources and with ever greater urgency.

Let me cite just a few random examples:

Less than 2 weeks ago, the New York Times reviewed the drop in farm income caused by falling prices and stringent acreage limitations in an article headlined "Crisis in Farming Threatens Boom." The subheads read "Income Sliding Fast," "Small Farm Forced Out." A well-documented article in the U. S. News & World Report for March 25 reminds us of the sinister parallel with the 1920's, when a spectacular industrial and financial boom obscured the early danger signals of a prolonged agricultural slump. The article states the facts with the logic of simplicity:

"Farmers are getting less for their crops. They are being forced to grow less. Their costs are high. Their incomes are shrinking."

And it concludes that "the farm problem is worsening, now that more trouble lies ahead."

THE FACTS SHOW THE OMINOUS TREND

Congressional committees have repeatedly studied the farm problem and have reported the ominous downward trend. In reporting out the Agricultural Act of 1954 in the 83d Congress, the House Committee on Agriculture reported a 13 percent decline in net farm income in the preceding 2 years, while the rest of the economy reached new heights. In reporting out a new farm bill last month, the same committee again reviewed the facts:

"Farm prices down an average of 22 percent since 1951. Net farm income down 28 percent since 1947—10 percent below 1953, with further declines scheduled for this year and 1956."

The House Appropriations Committee reports that "the cost of farming continues to increase, with a 14-percent increase in prices paid by farmers during the past 5 years." Farm mortgage debt has nearly doubled since the end of World War II.

Farmers' share in the national income has dropped from 9.4 percent in 1951 to 7.2 percent in 1954.

Yet consumers have not benefited from lower prices. Packaging and other costs of distribution and merchandising have in-

creased the spread between farm and grocery store prices. Thus, between 1949 and 1954, food grains dropped 9 percent, but cereals and bakery products rose 22 percent; dairy products rose 6 percent at retail but brought the farmer 8 percent less, and fruit and vegetable growers got 4 percent less while housewives paid 12 percent more. Farmers now receive only 43 cents—gross, not net—of each dollar spent on food, while the other 57 cents go for distribution charges.

The crisis is not confined to 1 or 2 sectors of agricultural production. In the Capital, we know that the squeeze between high costs and reduced acreage and support levels has hit cotton, corn, and other commodities as well as the wheat and the sugar beets of Oregon. The farm problem exists for the growers of fruits and vegetables in the Willamette Valley, and—as my wife's mother has graphically told me of her own farm—it is acute for the dairy farmers of the Northwest, of the Midwest, and elsewhere.

But perhaps the case of wheat will serve as a good single example.

THE CASE OF WHEAT

In its April issue, the Farm Journal poses the question, "Can We Rescue Wheat?" This article, and the other sources I have mentioned, give us some of the dimensions of the problem.

The carryover of wheat on July 1 will be nearly a billion bushels—as much as 5 times the amount considered a normal carryover—and \$2½ billion worth of that is held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The carryover will be more than a whole year's supply of wheat for this country, without this year's crop.

Yet acreage restrictions—which have forced 24 million acres, about 30 percent, out of wheat—and reduced support percentages show little promise of restoring order to wheat production. Rather, they add to the pressure to grow varieties which will yield the most bushels per acre, regardless of quality—to produce more wheat, of types which no one else may want, for the number one customer, the Federal Government.

What kind of a national farm policy can provide a solution?

I do not pretend to know the answer. I declined to pose as a specialist on agricultural legislation during the campaign last year, and I have not become an expert in 3 months in the Senate. But I return to my original point: The danger to our national economy of the threatening farm depression

is the greatest present problem we face in the field of domestic policy.

In the case of wheat, perhaps the domestic parity certificate plan—sometimes called the "two price plan"—offers some hope. That is not a new approach; Congress approved parts of it long ago in the McNary-Haugen bill, and the House of Representatives has recently revived it. Its relation to the support programs for corn and other feed grains, and to a stable world market, will require careful scrutiny.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS INADEQUATE

But in this field we cannot seek perfection; we must choose between imperfect alternatives. The administration offers no leadership beyond its insistence on the economic wringer of its "flexible" support program, which seems designed to seek a kind of agricultural "survival of the fittest" by putting a substantial number of farm families through bankruptcy. To call this approach inadequate is an understatement. Over 20 million people live on farms, and over 30 million live in rural areas economically dependent on farm prosperity. It is completely illusory to contemplate a continued boom for big business, for banks, for the stock market, while an agricultural depression knocks the economic props out from under these 50 million Americans—one-third of the Nation.

RURAL AMERICA NEGLECTED

The purely economic future of our farm population and of our small rural communities presents problems of great difficulty and, as I have said, of immense importance. But in the formulation of other national policies which affect farmers, whether as farmers or simply as citizens living in the rural areas of our country, their interests are often neglected by the present administration.

I shall take time only to mention briefly a few examples.

The great tax reduction bill of 1954 gave billions of dollars in tax savings to industrial corporations and their shareholders, but it gave no or very little relief to individual taxpayers, including the average farm family.

The second Hoover Commission—not to be confused with its predecessor, which avoided policy questions and stuck to administrative efficiency—recently recommended sharp curtailment of a series of Federal lending programs which have made low-interest credit available for necessary purposes, many of them of special value to farmers. Chief among the latter has been the rural electrification program. Already starved for power by the power policies of the present administration, this valuable program, which has brought modern civilization to millions of farm families, faces extinction if the views of the Commission prevail.

The ambitious road construction program submitted to the Congress by the administration recommends total expenditures on highway construction in excess of \$100 billion. Twenty-five billion dollars are to be furnished by the Federal Government to be expended over the next 10 years. Only \$4½ billion of this is "pay-as-you-go" financing; \$20½ billion are to be borrowed at a cost of \$11½ billion in interest, at rates significantly higher than those usual for obligations of the Federal Government.

You may have read about the weird financing scheme devised to raise this large Federal contribution without adding to the national debt. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works, which is considering highway legislation, and I have heard administration witnesses explain this project. But the best thumbnail sketch was provided by Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, the Senate's chief watchdog of fiscal probity, who

appeared as a witness to tell the committee:

"It establishes a Government corporation without income or assets and authorizes this corporation to borrow \$21 billion for 32 years without declaring it as a debt, and by ledger-dominance excludes this debt from the debt limitation fixed by Congress. The interest will be \$11.5 billion or 55 percent of the funds borrowed."

In view of Senator BYRD's stinging dissection of this scheme, it is widely conceded that the fiscal features of the administration's program will not be adopted. But beyond that the program itself places far too great an emphasis on completion of the interstate network, at the expense of the secondary and farm-to-market roads.

We need a network of safe and fast limited access highways for long-distance travel and transportation. But the needs of our rural population to travel between the smaller towns and to take their produce to market must necessarily be met from the same sources of financing which will pay for the interstate system. We cannot afford a program which will dry up those sources in the interest of fast transportation between our metropolitan centers and starve out the badly needed improvements of the other types of roads.

I expect the Subcommittee on Roads, under the able chairmanship of Senator GORE, of Tennessee, to strike a reasonable balance between these needs. At the same time, I think it essential that the necessary financing be more nearly on a pay-as-you-go basis. Therefore, I have proposed a 1-cent increase in the Federal tax on motor fuels, while exempting farmers and fishermen who use gasoline or diesel oil in off-the-road equipment.

REAL AID FOR EDUCATION NEEDED NOW

The same preoccupation with fiscal gimmicks rather than with real needs is delaying progress in a field equally important to urban and rural communities—the approaching crisis in our educational facilities. Again, the administration's proposals are expressed in terms of very large sums of money, but offer virtually no real assistance. The only direct aid offered by the administration program—a very small amount—would be available only to so-called impoverished school districts. The districts of Oregon—and the same is true elsewhere in the Nation—are staggering under an ever-growing burden of school needs to cope with rapid increases in school population, but they are not "impoverished." Yet, except for the small sums offered to impoverished districts, the administration offers only new borrowing facilities.

Not only are our overburdened school districts thus to be encouraged to add to their debts, but, as Mr. Rex Putnam, the State of Oregon's superintendent of public instruction, wrote me, the administration's proposal to underwrite a 3½-percent interest rate on school loans might stimulate a wave of borrowing so as actually to drive up interest rates which now average less than 2½ percent.

The need is urgent for real help now, not for studies and conferences. A generation of children who get part-time education in old, overcrowded schools is forever lost to our vital reservoirs of skill and leadership. Therefore, I have cosponsored and urged passage of Senator HILL's bills for immediate aid to school construction, and to earmark for aid to education the Federal oil revenues from the outer Continental Shelf.

PRIVILEGE TO SERVE WITH SENATOR MORSE AND REPRESENTATIVE EDITH GREEN

In much of the legislative work of which I have spoken, and in our efforts to assist our constituents with problems in the Na-

tional Capital, I have been privileged to cooperate closely with my two colleagues who also represent Multnomah County in the Congress—our senior Senator WAYNE MORSE and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN. I have benefited much from Senator MORSE's wide knowledge and the experience he has gained in 10 years of representing the interests of the people of Oregon in the Senate. And Mrs. GREEN has at once established herself, as we who know her knew she would, as one of the outstanding freshmen of this or any other session. I look forward to working in close association with these two fine, liberal, public servants in the years ahead.

Many issues which come before the Congress appear there in forms shaped by party programs and party strategy. This is a necessary result of the organization of Senate and House committees by the majority party with proportionate minority representation, and it is essential if our great national political parties are to remain alternative instruments of representative government.

Sometimes the lines get badly blurred. The reciprocal-trade agreements law, for example, is a program of Democratic origin which the Republican administration of President Eisenhower has made a cornerstone of his legislative program. Yet, although a Republican President has called its extension essential to our national interest, the reciprocal-trade bill can be passed only by the efforts of a majority of Democrats over the opposition of a majority of Republicans. Our own legislature in Salem, dominated by the party whose chief slogan is that it likes Ike, has memorialized the Congress to defeat the reciprocal-trade bill. The resolution against granting the President's urgent request for this important authority passed the State senate with the support of 17 of the 24 Republicans and the house with the votes of 30 of the 35 members of the President's party.

In this field, I think my own party in the Congress has shown a sense of responsibility for putting national above sectional and local interest.

SEARCH FOR PEACE ABOVE PARTISANSHIP

But I want to close by referring briefly to that area of congressional responsibility which must transcend partisanship, the field of foreign policy.

In the short 3 months since the day I first took my seat in the Senate, our Government has made foreign policy decisions of historic importance. My seat in the Senate is No. 96, and I have been most conscious of being the most junior of freshmen Senators during consideration of these important decisions.

In domestic matters bearing upon the economic and social direction of his administration, I have—as I have discussed earlier today—felt both competent and free to oppose the President's policies. But in matters of foreign policy I have, sometimes in spite of misgivings, voted to give the President the support he needs to carry out his responsibilities as the spokesman of our Nation in its relations with foreign governments. Thus, I voted for the Formosa Resolution, for the mutual defense treaty with Nationalist China, and just last week for ratification of the agreements admitting an independent West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and paving the way for its rearmament.

I believe that, as long as we have confidence in the purposes and objectives of a President in foreign affairs, we must permit him the authority to match his responsibility. During the last administration, the opposition in Congress constantly fought this principle of Executive responsibility in foreign affairs—a fight that culminated in the near-passage of the Bricker amendment.

But I am confident that President Eisenhower's objective is peace. We know in

Washington that the American people do not want war over Quemoy and Matsu, and I think the desire for peace will prevail. If, as I have said, I have had misgivings, it has been because the deliberate uncertainty of our position toward those island outposts of Chiang Kai-shek has seemed to me unnecessarily costly.

Eventually, I think, the President will decide against war. But in the meantime, a heavy strain has been put on our Atlantic Alliance, which must remain the keystone of our global policies. Attention has been diverted from more important crises in Southeast Asia, which are of greater significance to the free world. And ammunition has been given those who picture us as a nation dedicated to atomic militarism, when the real problems of Asia require economic solutions, technical assistance, and above all, mutual confidence and understanding.

Thus, critical issues and room for disagreement remain even in the field of foreign policy. But the record shows, I think, that this debate is generally being kept at a level above party politics, and that most of us seek alternative ways to the goal which is common to the entire Nation—peace with security.

Disposal of Projects Built by the WPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an opinion of the General Counsel, General Services Administration, concerning the rights of municipalities in the disposal of buildings or projects constructed under WPA. I believe this opinion will answer questions which have arisen in many communities throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1955.
Re WPA-built barn, Belvidere, S. Dak.
HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Reference is made to your letter of January 21, which was referred for reply to this office by the Architect of the United States. The inquiry sought information concerning any interest the Federal Government may have in a barn erected by the WPA in the town of Belvidere, S. Dak., which is presently being considered by town officials for disposal by sale.

An exhaustive research of the files of the Works Project Administration reveals that the town of Belvidere, Jackson County, S. Dak., acted as official sponsor of project OP-65-1-74-2324 to "tear down and salvage materials from abandoned lumberyard, storage sheds on private property for use in constructing horse barn, hog house, stock pavilion and corrals, 500 feet of 2-inch water main from town system to project and perform incidental and appurtenant work thereon on town-owned property."

The foregoing quotation appears in an agreement signed by W. E. Kuhn, chairman, town board, June 1940, which also contained the following restriction: "No sale or other division of the property from public use and control will be made during the useful life of

the improvements created under this project." The completion date of this project was October 29, 1940.

In the case of the *United States v. City of Columbus*, decided December 3, 1943, United States District Court of North Dakota, N. W. D. (54 Fed. Supp. 37), the United States sought to recover from the city of Columbus, N. Dak., the amount expended by it for the cost of materials used and labor performed in the construction of a community recreation building as a WPA project, leased by the city as a liquor store. The court on motions for judgment on the pleadings stated as follows:

"A review of plaintiff's complaint indicates that by virtue of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 (15 U. S. C. A., secs. 721-728), the United States of America agreed with the city of Columbus for the erection of a certain project described as: 'Demolishing old building and construction of the community recreation building'; that the project was properly approved, and that 'the project herein alleged was by this plaintiff in all things performed and completed on January 31, 1939, in the total cost of materials and labor in the sum of \$3,729.90'.

"The complaint alleges that the defendant 'did convert the project herein * * * in that the said defendant leased same to a private individual for the operation of a liquor store, and by reason thereof, the plaintiff herein is entitled to recover from the defendant, the sum of \$3,729.90, the amount expended by this plaintiff for the project herein described.' In effect plaintiff contends that all projects constructed by or through the authority of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 shall be or are impressed with an easement or a restriction limiting the use of such completed projects to the uses described in the act, and that a local municipality, incidentally benefited by the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, could use the project thus created only for the purposes set forth therein.

"(1) It seems to me essential, in order to determine whether or not plaintiff's complaint states a cause of action upon which relief could be granted, and that examination be made of the act in question and its purposes ascertained. The evident and declared policy of Congress in passing the various Emergency Relief Acts was that of reducing and relieving unemployment. The joint resolution of June 29, 1937 (ch. 401, 50 U. S. Stat. 352; 15 U. S. C. A., secs. 721-728), begins by stating:

"That in order to continue to provide relief, and work relief on useful public projects, * * * there is hereby appropriated, * * * (money) to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President, * * * and no non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under this appropriation unless and until the sponsor has made a written agreement to finance such part of the entire cost thereof as it is not to be supplied from Federal funds."

"Numerous courts have had opportunity to define the purposes of the various Federal Emergency Relief Acts:

"Courts have judicially noticed the fact that the primary objective of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (15 U. S. A., sec. 728 note) was not to benefit particular municipalities or localities, but to provide relief for unemployment.

"By contributing a small part of the necessary expense and by contributing the services of a superintendent and a small number of employees the city of Los Angeles was able to obtain the benefit of the project. It was not, however, city work of which the city had control, but was under the rules and regulations of the Emergency Relief Administration. (*Hoover v. Independent School Dist.*, supra (220 Iowa 1364, 264 N. W. 611); *Shelton v. City of Greenville*, 169 Tenn. 366, 87 S. W. 2d 1016; *Todaro v. City of*

Shreveport, supra (La. App. 170 So. 356, 360))." (*Taylor et al. v. City of Los Angeles* (29 Cal. App. 2d 181, 84 P. 2d 242, 243).)

"We are dealing here with emergency measures which represent the exercise of policy power and have for their purpose the relief of persons in distress by reason of the financial and economic depression. Their primary purpose is to furnish work to the unemployed. The question of making public improvements is secondary; and is but a means of carrying out the primary purpose." (*Village of Larchmont, et al. v. Town of Mamaronec, et al.* (249 App. Div. 741, 291 N. Y. S. 716, 718).)

"The sole and primary purpose of the various emergency relief appropriation acts and the executive order of the President made in connection therewith, is to give employment to persons requiring relief, and involves a work relief program." (*Block v. Sassaman* (D. C., 26 F. Suppl. 105, 106).)

"The Supreme Court of Massachusetts had occasion to pass upon the purpose of the various emergency relief acts. In doing so that court stated:

"Running through all the laws enacted, the purpose of the Federal Government is found to relieve unemployment directly, through projects, so called. The plan of employment involved the doing by the Government itself of these projects, which, as in the case at bar, theretofore were carried on by the municipalities themselves with some possible assistance from the Commonwealth and county. But we view these projects as undertaken not for the benefit of the municipality, but primarily for the purpose of relieving unemployment, and incidentally for the utility and convenience of the general public, as distinguished from the municipality itself." (*Benoit v. Hathaway* (1941, 310 Mass. 362, 38 N. E. 2d 329, 331).)

"(2) It is apparent from plaintiff's complaint that * * * the project herein alleged was by this plaintiff in all things performed and completed on January 31, 1939 * * *. We are then confronted with the question of what control the United States of America could exercise over the project after its completion. It is apparent that the primary purpose of the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts had been accomplished when the project was completed. Unemployment had been lessened; relief in the way of public work had been granted. The United States had paid those properly certified as needing relief for such work as they performed on the project, which, according to the complaint, the plaintiff itself completed. The money was not paid by the United States to the city of Columbus. The city of Columbus, by having a completed building in place of an old and inadequate one, was incidentally benefited. But the purpose of the act was not to benefit the city of Columbus, nor to erect a community building for the city of Columbus. The primary purpose, as stated, was to relieve unemployment, and when the project was completed that purpose had been served. Nowhere in the act do we find any authority or justification for the theory that projects thus completed may be used only for the purposes designated in the act. If the contrary were true, and if the Government's theory were sound, then the Federal Government could exercise control over the many thousands of non-Federal projects created out of WPA labor. That control would not be for any limited time, but theoretically would be forever, or at least until such projects were no longer susceptible of any practical use. The public ball park of a municipality would forever remain a public ball park unless the Federal Government (provided even it had the authority under the theory advanced) consented to its being used for other purposes. Congress intended no such control over incidental benefits of the relief program, and I find no justification for such theory in the acts involved. It is quite true that Congress, in its appropriation, limited the proj-

ects upon which such appropriations could be expended. Had the city of Columbus asked for the approval of a project creating a privately operated apartment house, the project would not, of course, have received departmental or executive approval. But once a project, which in its application meets the specifications required by law, and receives approval, and is constructed under the supervision and control of WPA officials, is completed and turned over to the municipality, it is turned over without being impressed with an easement or right or restriction controlled by the United States, and may be used thereafter by the municipality in any manner which the laws governing that municipality allow. A contrary conclusion would, in my opinion, result in entanglements of such infinite complication as to be impossible of administration, judicial or otherwise, and was never within the contemplation of Congress.

"(3) It is true that the plaintiff's complaint alleges that the defendant agreed that 'the work proposed will be done in full conformance with all legal requirements,' and also that 'All operations will be in accordance with regulations prescribed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, and orders and regulations issued thereunder,' and that section 8 of Operating Procedure G-1, issued by the Works Progress Administration, provided that 'Projects must be genuinely useful to the public' and 'Projects shall not be undertaken for the benefit of private * * * individuals * * *,' and that ' * * improvements may be made only to public property * * *,' which property is held either for the conduct of normal governmental function or for the general use of the public."

"It will be observed, however, that nowhere in the complaint is it alleged that the defendant had any control over the construction of the project, nor is it alleged that in the actual construction there was any deviation from the bare provisions of the law, nor from the regulations which were duly issued by proper authority thereunder. The United States, plaintiff herein, through its officials and its agents, had full control of the construction and completion of the project sponsored by the city of Columbus.

"The type of project or proposal, as alleged in the complaint, was a proper one, and the complaint alleges that the plaintiff 'in all things performed and completed' the project. Nowhere in the complaint is there an allegation to the effect that the defendant agreed that after the completion of the project the same would be used in any specified manner or for any particular purpose or purposes. There has been alleged no fraud on the part of the defendant. The complaint merely alleges that the defendant 'converted' the project, that is, 'the community recreation building,' by leasing the same to a private individual for the operation of a liquor store. The answer, incidentally, denies that the defendant leased the building to another for the operation of a liquor store, but asserts that it operates a municipal liquor store therein and has a contract of employment with the one who manages it. There may be some question whether, under the laws of the State of North Dakota, the city of Columbus could itself operate a municipal liquor store. But, with such questions the United States has no concern. The interest of the United States in the project ceased when the primary purpose of the act had been served through giving work relief, by completion of the project, and its release to the defendant.

"For the reasons stated I am of the opinion that the complaint fails to state a cause of action and the case will be ordered dismissed."

Accordingly, it would appear that the several Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts do not require, in the absence of fraud, any WPA projects authorized thereunder to be

used only for the purpose contemplated in the act after their completion.

The completed project when turned over to the municipality is not impressed with any right or restriction controlled by the United States but may be used or disposed of by the municipality in any manner allowed by the laws governing it when the project has served the purpose for which Federal assistance was granted, viz., the relief of unemployment, or when its useful life, as determined by the responsible town officials, has lapsed.

Sincerely yours,

GENERAL COUNSEL.

FHA Facilities for El Paso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit the following letter which, as the date indicates, was written by me on April 7, 1955, as the result of an incident which transpired during the time Congress was in recess for the Easter holidays:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1955.

Mr. GEORGE HERVEY,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR Mr. HERVEY: In connection with our telephone conversation of yesterday, you implied that a newspaper report had intentionally or unintentionally left the impression that I was condemning or was critical of persons who sent me telegrams in support of a Federal Housing Administration insuring office in El Paso. Such was not my position or intentions, and I therefore want to state very clearly and as concisely as possible the full situation.

I was recently contacted by an individual who informed me that he was the authorized chairman of a committee of the El Paso Home Builders Association, the purpose and sole function of this committee being to obtain and present factual information to the FHA supporting the office for El Paso. I was specifically told that the approach and procedure would be to present these facts to the district office of the FHA in Lubbock, and then here in Washington.

I was told by this committee chairman that their intent was to show the need and justification for establishing the office in El Paso, and not to engage in political pressure tactics which might be harmful to the project. In this, I concurred.

This report had been transmitted, I understood, to Mr. Norman P. Mason, Chief of the Washington FHA office. The officials requested time to study the report and conduct an investigation and survey so that subsequently, if possible, such an office might be established in El Paso.

Within a few short hours after Mr. Mason had started the survey, an attorney from El Paso, who said he represented you, Sam Guido, Jr., and a Mr. Kirkpatrick et al., presented himself in my office and stated that he was interested in obtaining the office. He made it clear that he represented only a small group of the El Paso Home Builders Association and that he was not to be considered as spokesman for the majority of the members of this organization. He explained to me that under the conditions of a contract he had with you and others, he would

be paid the sum of \$5,000 if the office should be obtained for El Paso.

He also stated to me that he urged his clients to engineer a telegram campaign to coincide with his efforts. Now bear in mind that at this time I had not received formal, informal, official or unofficial requests to exert efforts in behalf of obtaining the FHA facilities for El Paso.

I had not received any fact, information or statistics which would place me in a position to make a formal or logical request, and present to the official here the case, founded on facts and not fancy, in behalf of El Paso. Neither you, nor anyone in your particular group, at this point had contacted me in regard to the project requesting the establishment of such an office in El Paso, nor of the status of the situation. As stated, I had no facts whatsoever. Instead, I was greeted by 98 telegrams, and, I presume, others will come.

My position as regards those who sent the telegrams is this: These persons, I assume, were informed by you or your group that their help was needed in obtaining this facility. You possibly told them that the congressional officials here—Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator PRICE DANIEL, and myself—had all the facts and all we needed was an avalanche of telegrams expressing interest in the project, in order to be able to get it.

These people who sent the telegrams were sincere, civic-minded citizens who, upon the advice given by uninformed and unfair individuals, were given an erroneous impression and were denied the benefit of the full facts. These people were unaware of the true status and situation.

Had you and your group taken the time and effort to have checked with the Texas Senators and myself, we would have told you that we would be happy to work on the project if you would but furnish us the facts we needed. Then after we had presented the case to the FHA and the proper officials had made a study, should the request have been denied, we would have welcomed and, in fact, solicited additional statements from business and civic leaders in El Paso.

Not only were your actions ill-timed, and of such nature as to possibly hinder our project, but if you had checked you would have known that Congress is not in session due to the Easter holidays and that both Texas Senators are out of town and will be for 2 weeks hence. (I might add, I am here because although the House is in recess, there is much other work than House action to be done here in Washington.)

May I sum this up by stating that at no time will I condemn people for expressing their opinions, and, in fact, I encourage and cordially invite such opinions. But it grieves me deeply when the expressions are engineered on unsuspecting and sincere people who believe in their hearts and minds that they are rendering a service; when, unknown to them, their sincere desire to be helpful is being used for other motives.

Furthermore, I think it was unethical and improper for anyone to pay, or to offer to pay, anyone else a sum of money for obtaining a legitimate project from the Government, for the good of the community. This in itself casts an undesirable reflection upon the project and besides is unkind in its implied purpose of discrediting the sincerity, ability, and desire for cooperation and achievement of the two Members of the United States Senate from Texas, and myself.

I feel that because of a lack of cooperation on your part and the lack of sincerity and purpose of a few individuals, the possibility of obtaining the office for El Paso has been endangered and possibly destroyed. And, I might add, until these tactics were used I think the project had a better-than-fair chance of being obtained.

For your information may I state that I am still personally and officially in support of the project to obtain these FHA facilities

for El Paso. I think the request, if based upon fact and legitimate information, is fair; I believe the facility is needed and desirable. And I am hopeful that we can wash away the dirt which has been splattered on this project, making it eventually possible to obtain this service.

Mr. Hervey, the case is not a new one. Such instances have happened in the past, and I suppose, will continue to happen in the future. But it is unfortunate when a few selfish individuals by their intentional or unintentional actions, take a decent, fine, and respectable thing and cause it to be smeared or destroyed.

As I stated to you on the telephone yesterday, in addition to the tactics outlined above, certain improper, illegal, and unethical proposals were made to me in conjunction with this project and I deeply resent such actions. My present position is not to further amplify these advances. My sole reason is not to further jeopardize or cast an ill reflection upon the project and a host of decent citizens who are sincere in their efforts to obtain this FHA facility. However, I will not hesitate to recall the situation around these advances should it justify the purpose.

I hope in the future it will be possible for us to achieve a unity in purpose, brought about by a sincere desire to be of service to the community, in this and other projects. I'll assure you such service to the people of west Texas is my sole purpose and intent.

Sincerely,

J. T. RUTHERFORD,
Congressman, 16th District, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose here is to serve notice to this group and to all concerned that I shall not tolerate such tactics or procedure, and that the situation and position stated, by request is here given. It is my hope that we will now go forward for the benefit of all. Nothing could be accomplished by continuing this affair further except to destroy this project and friendly relations.

Proposed Revision of McCarran-Walter Immigration Act—Excerpts From Statements by Governor Harriman, of New York, Senator Lehman, Paul M. Butler, and Carmine G. De Sapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on March 9, 1955, the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee held what was called a strategy dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. The dinner was presided over by the eminent and truly distinguished Governor of Michigan, Hon. G. Mennen Williams, who is the new chairman of the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee.

At that dinner a most impressive group of leading figures in American political life addressed the gathering. One of the recurrent themes of most of the remarks made at that meeting was the need to revise and overhaul the McCarran-Walter Act. I ask unanimous consent that

pertinent excerpts from the remarks made by Gov. Averell Harriman, of my own State of New York; by Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; and by Mr. Carmine G. De Sapio, National Democratic Committeeman from New York, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with pertinent excerpts from a message which I addressed to the assembly, and which was read in my behalf by my administrative assistant, Mr. Julius C. C. Edelstein.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE DINNER OF THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, MARCH 8, 1955

You who are here tonight have an especially deep and personal understanding of the need for the United States to take its proper place of leadership in the world.

No nation can go it alone—not even powerful America. From a military standpoint, we cannot. From an economic standpoint, we cannot.

But over and beyond these materialistic reasons are others just as compelling—reasons of history and religion and culture, of sentiment and emotion. America will always be bound to the lands where all of us, whether recently or long ago, have our family roots.

The sons and daughters of every one of the nations bordering on the Atlantic and the Mediterranean and the European seas and rivers have made their contributions to America—contributions of industry and enterprise and character. We have a common heritage. And so we who happen to be on this side of the Atlantic can never forget that we are part of a larger community. And none in that community can be secure unless all are secure.

Nor can any of us be truly secure as long as a large part of our community—reaching from the Baltic States through Poland and Czechoslovakia, to the borders of Greece—remains enslaved. We know that the flame of freedom will never be extinguished in those countries, and that they will again one day carry on their proud traditions in liberty and self-government.

So our common goal—and the goal of our Nation's foreign policy—must be to strengthen the ties that bind together the North Atlantic community, and beyond that the larger community of all the free countries of the world.

I need not tell this audience how injurious to this whole objective is our own immigration policy. Two and a half years ago the President said the McCarran Act had to be revised to eliminate its discriminatory, un-American features. But today the McCarran Act still stands as written—and still proclaims to the world that America does not really practice what she preaches about the equality and innate worthiness of all people of every land and creed. We can thank Senator LEHMAN and Congressman CELLER and their Democratic colleagues for taking the initiative to revise the act in the absence of the leadership the President had pledged.

Equally injurious is our refugee policy. An act of Congress proposed to admit 209,000 refugees over a 3-year period. Yet, as of January 28, when half the life of the act had passed, fewer than a thousand bona fide refugees had been admitted to this country. The administration of the act has made a travesty of what was to have been a great humanitarian undertaking.

Unhappily, in the last 2 years, there has been a tragic decline in American prestige

and influence among our friends and allies throughout the world.

Why is this? Why has it come about? I believe it can be traced to a basic cause—and that is the unwillingness of the Republican administration to do those things necessary to fulfill the role of world leadership which the circumstances of history press upon us.

The last 2 years have been a period of retreat from leadership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF HERBERT H. LEHMAN OF STATUETTE OF LIBERTY AT NATIONALITIES DIVISION DINNER, WALDORF-ASTORIA, MARCH 8, 1955, READ ON BEHALF OF SENATOR LEHMAN BY JULIUS C. C. EDELSTEIN

There was a time—not so long ago—when our country received immigrants annually, not in thousands or hundreds of thousands, but in millions. And who is there who can say that our country is not the greater for it today—a country which 300 years ago was impassable wilderness, unconquerable desert, and storm-swept mountain range. Our country today is the world's center of power—the leader in productivity and in technological progress: a land of challenging opportunity for all its citizens.

Yet today our immigration laws reflect not these great facts of our history and tradition, but rather the fearful prejudices of fearful minds which contrived 30 years ago to place on our statute books—and to maintain it ever since—a law steeped in bias and dedicated to the proposition that all men are not created equal, as far as admission to the United States is concerned.

We have slammed our gates shut, cut admission of legal immigrants down to a trickle, converted our immigration system into a series of hurdles and hazards built around race and national origin, and make a shabby mockery of our national traditions.

The national origins quota system, enshrined and revaluated in the McCarran-Walter Act, is a travesty upon America. It is a rebuke and insult to every one assembled at the Waldorf tonight; it is a reproach to every American. There are other provisions in that law, the McCarran-Walter Act, which demean the status of American citizenship, which make a joke of justice and fair dealing, and which treat every alien—immigrant or visitor—as a potential spy, saboteur, and criminal. All of this holds us up to contempt and criticism in the eyes and in the opinion of free mankind.

If there is one law, above all others, which furnishes grist for the Communist propaganda mill, and which is contrived to lend aid and comfort to the Kremlin, it is the McCarran-Walter Act.

How ridiculous we appeared in the eyes of the world only last week when a great chain of American newspapers proposed editorially that Russian farmers be invited to visit the United States to study our farming methods, and the Soviet Government quickly endorsed the proposal.

For it developed immediately, regardless of the wisdom of the idea itself, that the Russian farmers couldn't be admitted to the United States as visitors because of the McCarran-Walter Act * * * unless the Russian Government accredited these farmers as Soviet diplomats.

So, my friends, it seems to me that one of the first goals to be marked out, not only for the Nationalities Division, but for all Americans of goodwill—should continue to be the drastic amendment and overhaul of the McCarran-Walter Act, to eliminate its bias and prejudice; the iniquitous national origins quota system, and to humanize and liberalize that law in all its aspects, both citizenship and immigration, in order to make that law conform to the great traditions—the true traditions of America.

And I hope the Nationalities Division, and all its friends, and all those with whom it

has contact—and the Democratic National Committee—and all those with whom it has contact—will mobilize all possible support—in ever-increasing amounts—for the drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Act. And in this connection, I invite attention—and support—to the omnibus immigration and citizenship bill, S. 1206, introduced in the Senate on February 25 by myself and 12 colleagues—and in the House by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, and a number of his colleagues. I hope that in due time the Lehman-Celler bill will prevail.

I am glad to extend a similar invitation of support for this bill to the Republican National Committee, and to President Eisenhower. While my hopes are not high, I would be glad—and I know all of you would be glad—if that invitation were accepted.

SPEECH BY PAUL M. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, AT THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION DINNER, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 8, 1955

In this connection, let me speak of one of the men to whom we pay particular tribute tonight, the great Senator from New York, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who is one of the very finest statesmen of our times. Senator LEHMAN has for years been a leader in the fight of the Democratic Party for fairer immigration laws, the fight to rid our country of racial injustices, the fight to secure a constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and in no end of other causes where equality and liberty are at stake.

Senator LEHMAN continues to devote his time, his energy, and his life to these great goals. We in Washington look for him to be with us not only for another term, after 1956, but for many more terms.

Senator LEHMAN'S ideals represent in a sense what the Democratic Party seeks to accomplish for our citizens of foreign birth. Many of you are familiar with the bill of which he is a cosponsor, the Lehman-Celler bill, to revise and replace the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, which contains so many inequitable and discriminatory provisions.

The introduction of the Lehman-Celler bill to put our immigration laws more in step with the best in American traditions, is just one more example of how Democrats are offering positive and constructive policies to meet our Nation's needs. When Mr. Eisenhower was a candidate back in 1952, he said in a speech here in New York on October 16, 1952, that he thought the McCarran-Walter Act was discriminatory and ought to be revised.

But since January 1953, the Eisenhower administration has offered little more than talk about this matter, as is the case with so many other problems facing the American people. In the field of fairer immigration laws, it is left to the Democrats in Congress to introduce constructive proposals, while the Eisenhower administration backtracks, sidesteps, and doubletalks, exactly as it has done on schools and housing, tax reductions, and national defense.

You will recall that President Truman vetoed the McCarran-Walter act because he believed it discriminated, by means of the national origins quota system, against Italians, Greeks, Poles and others from Southern and Eastern Europe. This demonstrates the courage and devotion to principle that made Mr. Truman the great President that he was.

George Washington spoke from the heart of America when he said: "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the Opulent and Respectable Stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

The several bills introduced by distinguished Democratic Members of the Senate and the House to make our immigration laws a more faithful reflection of Washington's great affirmation ought to receive a full hearing in Congress and the support of all those who reject as un-American the discriminatory National Origins Quota System.

In considering these proposals, some of us might well remember what Will Rogers, a great Democrat who was part Indian, used to say: "My ancestors went down to the shore to meet the Pilgrims."

Just as we must turn to Democratic leadership if we are to expect intelligent revision of the Immigration act of 1952, so we must look for little forthrightness on the part of the Eisenhower administration if we hope to do anything about the mockery of humanitarianism represented by the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

That act was supposed to allow 214,000 refugees, escapees, expellees and orphans to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants. Yet under this act only 14,106 visas have been granted as of January 29, 1955. In other words, just a fraction of the total provided for has been admitted with the act due to expire next year. And of those who have come only 68 are escapees, only 204 are refugees. This from the Eisenhower administration which boasts that although conservative in economic matters, it is "liberal" with respect to human beings.

The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, pointed out only a few days ago that the operation of the Refugee Relief Act is "tangled and snarled in nightmares with nightmares, forms, questionnaires, security checks, duplication."

That we should seek to insure that no Communists or others who would subvert our free institutions enter America is something on which all of us certainly agree. But as Congressman CELLER said, the State is "playing a cruel game by pitting legal paragraphs against human lives. Escapees from behind the Iron Curtain (of the Communists) into free territory, beckoned by the light of liberty, have dared to cross barbed wire, risk gunfire, spend harrowing days and nights in escape from the Iron Curtain countries only to find themselves finally barred by bits of paper * * *"

Yet the Republican administration talks glibly of liberating enslaved peoples.

In the first 18 months of the Displaced Persons Act, enacted and administered by Democrats, over 126,000 displaced persons came to this country to build lives for themselves and to enrich American life by their presence.

Compare this number—these numbers of human beings, if you please—with the pitifully few persons admitted by an Eisenhower administration ostensibly devoted to a liberal attitude toward human life. You will then understand more deeply, I think, why it is the Democratic Party which offers most hope and most opportunity of realistic action on one of the problems of greatest interest to Americans of foreign descent.

ADDRESS BY DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE—MAN CARME G. DE SAPIO BEFORE THE 1956 STRATEGY DINNER SPONSORED BY THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 8, 1955

Although I have been able closely to observe the activities of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee through the years, tonight its effectiveness, its activities, and its significance have been brought home to me with vivid reality. This division, in every sense, is representative of our American population. Thirty-four million of us were born in other coun-

tries or are immediately descended from parents born in other countries. The rest of us are of ancestors who came to America not many generations ago in search of liberty, of faith, of hope, and of a secure future.

New York City itself is representative of the population of the world, and we New Yorkers are so proud of the achievements by Americans of French descent; Americans of Polish descent; Americans of German, Italian, Rumanian, Danish, Spanish, and South American descent; in fact, Americans who can trace their ancestry to every corner of the globe; Americans of all religious beliefs—Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic. We take pride—all of us—not only in our ancestry but in the fact that here we are just good American citizens, particularly devoted to our country, its ideals, and our fellow men and women.

This city, like our country, is enriched by the varied backgrounds from which our people come, and this city, in turn, has enriched our State, our country, and all of the world.

In our party's platform in 1952, we advocated the admission into our country of a considerable number of refugees, principally from lands behind the Iron Curtain.

These people have been the victims of barbarous totalitarianism, the cruelty of which staggers the imagination. They come from places in the world from which the relatives of many of us in this room come and they need haven and help. But the Republican Party, while giving lip service to the idea of extending aid to these refugees, wrote a law which contains so many obstacles and barriers as to be entirely meaningless. It is incumbent upon our conscience as a party and as a people to remedy this situation, so that the provisions for the admission of refugees will parallel our national heritage.

Likewise we have an immigration law which cruelly discriminates against countries from which many of our recent ancestors sent so many people who have made incalculable contributions to the welfare of our Nation. This immigration law disgraces both the dignity and the philosophy of our country and casts a cynical shadow upon the ideals expressed by Thomas Jefferson and the other authors of our national independence.

Medical Services to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution of the council of administration of the Michigan department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This resolution protests the suggested drastic reductions in Federal medical services to veterans and others as recommended in a recent report by the Hoover Commission.

I should like to add that I support the dissenting view to this report submitted by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD. It is not in keeping with the often expressed intent of Congress to take a narrow view of medical facilities for veterans. The veteran population continues high, and

as it grows older the need for medical service will increase.

It is essential that waste and inefficiency be eliminated but this should not be used as a guise to drastically reduce these important Federal medical facilities.

The following resolution was adopted at a meeting in Clare, Mich., and was transmitted to me by Christie J. Braun, department quartermaster, adjutant of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

I hereby move or resolve, as the case may be, that this council of administration go on record as opposing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission task force as they pertain to the treatment and handling of the veterans and their benefits in this country; and that the Hoover Commission be reminded that if they would serve these United States, they would cause to be worked out some method whereby the aged, the tubercular, the paraplegic, and the mentally disturbed veteran be taken care of as befits the greatest, and wealthiest, and the most powerful Nation yet to inhabit the face of this earth; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Michigan congressional delegation.

Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce Endorses Development of Trinity River Power by Private Utility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Santa Rosa, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, on March 29, 1955, endorsing development of power facilities on the Trinity River by a private utility.

We in California are very proud of the fine service and cooperation which we have had from private utilities. We feel that the best interests of our citizenry can more properly be served through private enterprise and numerous organizations and individuals throughout the First Congressional District of California have endorsed the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s proposal by which they would construct a considerable portion of the proposed Trinity River project.

I, personally, am of the opinion that the project should not be developed until a survey to determine present and future water needs in north coastal counties has been completed. However, if it should be authorized I firmly believe the "partnership plan" should be put into effect.

The resolution referred to above is as follows:

"Whereas the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has offered to enter into partnership with the United States Government on the Trinity River project; and

"Whereas they have offered to furnish, install, and operate at power company cost all

of the electrical elements of the project, including generators, switch gear, and lines; and

"Whereas this will constitute a saving of \$50 million in capital outlay to the United States Government; and

"Whereas they would pay the United States Government an agreed price per kilowatt hour for all current generated in the various powerhouses on the project; and

"Whereas the power company would agree to wheel power for the United States Government to agreed points connected with this project; and

"Whereas this would result in the producing of taxes from the electrical end of the project to the counties where said electrical equipment is located as well as to the State and Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce does sincerely support and endorse this partnership proposal of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. with the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman HUBERT SCUDDER, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, and Senator THOMAS KUCHEL."

Adopted at regular meeting of the board of directors of the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce the 29th day of March 1955.

Approved:

JAMES H. HURLEY,
President.

Attest:

SCOTT GORDON,
Acting Manager.

Would Lincoln Have Dismissed Corsi?—Remarks on the 90th Anniversary of His Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, April is a month of significant anniversaries. Ninety years ago on this April 14 Abraham Lincoln was assassinated at Ford's Theater in the Nation's Capital. That tragic event not only has made a lasting impression on American history but saddened and shocked the American people—even the leaders and the people in the South were shocked. For, as you know, the first memorial service for Lincoln was conducted by former Confederate veterans. The body of the President rested for a while under the dome of this Capitol Building and throngs of grieving Americans passed his bier.

It is to be regretted that the great crowds which visit the Nation's Capital each year cannot visit Ford's Theater where this tragic event took place. They cannot visit the Ford's Theater because there is no Ford's Theater. It is advertised as such but, in reality, the present building is merely a warehouse museum to which an admission is charged. Steps should be taken to restore the building as it was on that fatal night, when the mad actor, Booth, struck his fatal blow. Only last year the Congress authorized studies

looking toward a partial restoration at least. Let us hope that these studies go forward, and that the admission charge to enter this shrine be eliminated. There is no admission charge to the Lincoln Memorial, and there should be none at Ford's Theater.

Every school child knows the Lincoln story. Everyone who comes to our shores as visitors or as immigrants knows and is moved by the story of this great American who belongs to the ages. But, today, it is clear that some of the present-day leaders in the great political party which he played a major part in establishing have forgotten, if they ever knew, another part of the Lincoln story which is equally vital and valid, and equally important to our times.

Lincoln, the man of the people, had a high regard for the contribution which the immigrants to America through the years, and the descendants of those who reached our shores in earlier years, have made to our country, for the richness and variety of cultures they brought; for the sacrifices they have made in the battles fought to preserve and strengthen our country; and the contributions these peoples from all the countries of the earth have made to every phase of our lives.

In a speech in Cincinnati, on February 12, 1861, Lincoln said:

In regard to Germans and foreigners, I esteem them not better than other people, nor any worse. It is not my nature when I see a people borne down by the weight of their shackles—the oppression of tyranny—to make their life more bitter by heaping upon them greater burdens; but rather would I do all in my power to raise the yoke than to add anything that would tend to crush them * * * If there are any abroad that desire to make this the land of their adoption, it is not in my heart to throw aught in their way to prevent them from coming to the United States.

One thinks of the lonely railsplitter, the war President, the man of the people, enshrined forever in the magnificent Lincoln Memorial in Washington which is visited by thousands each year from all parts of the country, whose writings and deeds live forever in the lives and minds of his countrymen. And one finds in his words spoken to the German community at Cincinnati an echo in the immortal stanzas of Emma Lazarus which are inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shores.
Send these, your homeless, tempest-tossed to me.

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Yes, we recognize that the political party which Abraham Lincoln helped to establish has contributed much to American life, to the realization of Lincoln's ideas, to the fulfillment of the American dream. But Lincoln's concern with the workingman, with the common people, the concern that was expressed in so many of his speeches, and in such phrases as: "God must have loved the common people, he made so many of them," and his concern with the foreigner who comes to our shore to make

a new life has been often forgotten and often betrayed.

The political party which made him President has come upon evil days, indeed, when one of its leading figures can take the position he has in regard to the refugee problem, and in regard to Edward J. Corsi, an immigrant born in Italy. I would like to quote here from an editorial in the *Trenton Evening Times* of Tuesday, April 12, 1955:

THE CASE OF CORSI

A great deal of difficulty has been experienced during recent years in retaining desirable and highly qualified men in the Federal service. Washington holds little appeal for them and for one reason or another they pack their bags and depart for home, with or without a friendly note of regret and thanks from President Eisenhower.

There has never been any deep mystery as to the reasons for the continuing turnover in high places in the Government service. It is to be found principally in the readiness of the administration to offer a victim in sacrifice once the wolves begin to howl.

The case of Edward J. Corsi stands as a notable example of official cowardice. Mr. Corsi was regarded as ideally fitted for the post of special immigration adviser when he was named 3 months ago. He was a leading New York Republican who had been the party's candidate for mayor and had held important public offices.

But he proved to be a champion of liberal immigration policies and as such aroused the opposition of the restrictionists.

There were no definite and specific charges, nor is there anything in the record to support a suspicion against Mr. Corsi. In fact, only 8 days ago he was lauded by President Eisenhower for his "integrity and ability." Nevertheless, Secretary of State Dulles, surrendering supinely to a single critic, has dismissed him.

Why should men of ability and loyalty bother with public service when they are aware that there is always the danger that they will be subjected to such indignity?

One can think how saddened Lincoln would be were he alive today to see the ignoble position taken by his party's leaders.

I have joined a number of my colleagues in introducing a bill, H. R. 4533, to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes.

I can think of no greater tribute to Abraham Lincoln than to make the Refugee Relief Act work as it was intended to work by the Congress, and to enact into law H. R. 4533, which would carry out the noblest of the American traditions.

Mendocino County Chambers of Commerce Endorse Proposed Trinity River Power Development Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a telegram signed by chamber of

commerce officials from various communities in Mendocino County, Calif., endorsing construction and development of power on the Trinity River by private enterprise.

Considerable interest has been generated throughout my congressional district in the proposal offered by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., to develop power phases of the proposed Trinity River project. One such expression of interest is a telegram dated April 13, signed by the president of the Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce; the president of the Ukiah Chamber of Commerce; the president of the Willits Chamber of Commerce, the president of the Fort Bragg Chamber of Commerce, and the director of the Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce. These leaders endorse the "partnership plan" as a sound business proposal which would result in a savings of several million dollars to Federal taxpayers in construction costs, and return to the Federal and local governments tax revenues amounting to multimillions of dollars.

I firmly believe the proposal made by the Bureau of Reclamation by which private enterprise would develop power facilities on the Trinity River should be favorably considered by the Congress.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

UKIAH, CALIF., April 13, 1955.

Representative HUBERT SCUDDER,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We note by press release Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has made a formal proposal to the United States Bureau of Reclamation for partnership construction of the Trinity River project. We endorse this plan as a sound business proposal which would result in a tax savings of several million dollars to the people as well as a saving to the Federal Government by private capital investment.

DON MACMILLAN,

President, Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce.

CLAUDE FALCONER,

President, Ukiah Chamber of Commerce.

OSCAR GRUTER,

President, Willits Chamber of Commerce.

GUS NICHOLAS,

President, Fort Bragg Chamber of Commerce.

JAMES PELLASCIO,

Director, Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce, Point Arena.

Fortieth Anniversary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the youngest of the laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which is observing its 40th anniversary today, is located at the edge of the Cleveland Hopkins Municipal Airport. Its name, the Lewis Flight Propulsion

Laboratory, tells its mission—power plant research.

Here, more than 2,500 specialists are searching for ways and means to make our engines—the turbojets, the ram jets, and the rockets—more powerful and more economical in fuel consumption. Upon the success of their efforts depends, in large degree, how much faster and higher and farther can fly the airplanes and missiles we build tomorrow.

One of the most interesting and inspiring days I have ever spent came not long after the voters of the 23d District of Ohio elected me their Representative. Then, I visited the NACA's Lewis Laboratory to see at first hand what was being accomplished.

From Dr. E. R. Sharp, director of the great research center, I was told how the Cleveland location was chosen in 1940 as the site of the NACA's greatly expanded powerplant research activity. I was proud to hear again how the Cleveland businessmen had done everything within their power to assure that the site would be ideal, as in fact it has proved to be.

I was told, too, about the late Dr. George W. Lewis, for whom the laboratory is named. Director of NACA's research program from 1919 to 1947 when he retired because of broken health, as much a war casualty as any man who fell on the battlefield, Dr. Lewis had considered the new powerplant laboratory a personal responsibility, and despite the immensity of the burdens he carried at NACA headquarters here in Washington, he traveled each week to Cleveland to give personal attention to the many complex problems associated with improvement of aircraft engines.

As Dr. Sharp took me around the laboratory, I was impressed by the youth of the technical staff engaged in work which could mean victory or defeat for the United States in any future war. I was equally impressed by the intensity with which these young scientists were working.

Military security limits my telling you what is transpiring today at the Lewis Laboratory. But, by a single example, I believe I can illustrate how valuable is the work being done. Right after World War II, NACA research men at the Lewis Laboratory began pioneering work with thrust augmentation—burning additional quantities of fuel in the tailpipe of a turbojet engine. The problems were many; they were very difficult to solve. The result: today, afterburners are used on the engines which power most of our fast military aircraft. These afterburners can provide as much as a 100 percent increase in the thrust which the turbojet engine provides.

I was interested, just as I know every Member of Congress is interested, to learn what is being done at the Lewis Laboratory about harnessing nuclear energy to airplanes. Again, military security prevents me from making detailed comments, but this much it is proper to note:

The performance capabilities to be realized from using nuclear energy for aircraft propulsion will enable nonstop supersonic flight to any point on the face of the earth, and return. With so large a gain the goal, industry, the Atomic

Energy Commission, the military services, and the NACA are participating in vigorous, sustained attacks on the formidable technical problems that remain to be solved.

The huge, complex equipment that is used at the Lewis Laboratory in study of powerplant problems is very necessary, but in the last analysis, it is the caliber of the men and women who work there that counts most. From Dr. Sharp, on down, the people at the Lewis research center are representative of the best in the many scientific fields which have a bearing on aircraft propulsion. They are dedicated people. All America can be proud of the work they are doing.

Bolitha J. Laws, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Reports on Public Defenders Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter I received as chairman of Subcommittee No. 2, in connection with the public hearings on bills relating to representation of indigent defenders in United States district courts by public defenders:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
April 1, 1955.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: As requested by you when I appeared before your committee in Congress as a witness on Wednesday of this week, I am sending you herewith a statement of average sentences imposed by judges of this court compared with those imposed at other points. You doubtless will recall that in our court we handle major cases which customarily arise in State courts, as well as those which arise in United States courts. Therefore, the figures which we have assembled include certain types of United States cases such as narcotics, interstate car theft, fraud, and other thefts, assault and robbery on United States Government reservations and high seas, in respect of which our average sentence is compared with the national average; and we also compare cases usually arising in State courts such as various types of homicide, rape, larceny, robbery and burglary, in which we compare the average sentence here in comparison to the average sentence imposed in each of our neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia. We do not have readily available at this time the national average in State cases, since we have not been furnished figures from other than the two States mentioned. The figures which I am sending were furnished our court by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the United States Bureau of Prisons.

At various times in the past we have read about statements being made that our sentences in narcotics cases have been low. You

will note from the chart that the sentences in the District of Columbia in narcotics cases average over 2 years more than the national average. You will also note that with the sole exception of robbery cases, the average sentence imposed by our court in the District of Columbia in all of the categories listed is higher than the national average. I do not know the full definition of robbery in other jurisdictions, but I do know that in Washington robbery includes stealthy seizure and purse snatching, as well as armed or other robbery by force.

I am especially interested in calling your attention to our average sentence in rape cases. You may recall Congressman FORRESTER stated at the hearing on Wednesday he understood our average was around 2 years. In fact, the average sentence in rape cases for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, was 12.7 years, and in assault with intent to commit rape the average was 9.1 years. In addition to this, rape cases in the District of Columbia include the statutory crime of carnal knowledge, that is committed when a male has relations with any

female under 16 years of age, even with her consent.

The chart I am sending you is not in any great detail and relates only to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. (The Virginia figures cover the last 6 months of the fiscal year.) However, we have made similar studies as to previous years so far as cases in United States courts are concerned and the results have been substantially the same. I think you will agree the information I am sending you strikingly refutes some of the unfounded talk which has resulted from published articles within the last several years. In submitting these figures I do so in order that the true facts may be known to Members of Congress, some of whom apparently have been misinformed. I do not intend to convey the impression that I believe lengthy sentencing is the sole, or necessarily, the principal deterrent to crime.

I am grateful to you and the other members of your committee in making it possible to send you this information.

Sincerely yours,

BOLITHA J. LAWS.

Average sentences imposed for the offenses listed

Offense	United States District Court for the District of Columbia, year ended June 30, 1954		United States District Court for the District of Maryland, year ended June 30, 1954		United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, year ended June 30, 1954		The 86 United States district courts (District of Columbia excluded), year ended June 30, 1954	
	Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)
Interstate car theft.....	10	3.0	31	1.5	36	1.5	2,693	2.2
Car theft (local).....	71	2.9						
Fraud and other theft.....	73	4.1	68	1.7	34	1.5	3,567	1.9
Narcotics.....	201	5.7	7	4.6	2	3.5	1,483	3.4
Larceny.....	95	3.0						
Grand larceny.....	55	4.3						
Petit larceny.....	35	1.0						
Gambling.....	56	1.4						
Assault.....	95	4.5	2	2.0	23	2.8	225	2.6
Robbery.....	174	9.6			23	4.0	175	11.2
Burglary.....	172	6.8			21	3.0		
Murder:.....								
First degree.....	1	Death						
Second degree.....	13	28.5						
Manslaughter.....	31	9.9						
Manslaughter.....	26	11.3						
Negligent homicide.....	4	.7						
Abortion (death).....	1	10.0						
Rape.....	28	11.3						
Rape (carnal knowledge).....	17	12.7						
Assault to rape.....	11	9.1						

¹ Local offenses not usually tried in a Federal court.

² Offenses committed on United States reservations and high seas.

³ Includes 2 life sentences, computed at 45 years.

Average sentences imposed for selected local offenses in the District of Columbia during the year ended June 30, 1954, and in Virginia and Maryland during the 6 months ended June 30, 1954

Offense	Sentences imposed for District of Columbia local offenses by the District Court for the District of Columbia, year ended June 30, 1954		Sentences of prisoners received in State institutions, 6 months ended June 30, 1954			
	Number	Average maximum sentence (years)	Virginia		Maryland	
			Number	Average sentence (years)	Number	Average sentence (years)
Murder.....	13	28.5	42	19.9	41	11.4
Manslaughter.....	31	9.9	23	3.4	29	4.7
Robbery.....	174	9.6	59	12.8	186	7.5
Assault.....	95	4.5	101	2.8	266	1.6
Burglary.....	172	6.8	330	4.3	399	2.8
Larceny.....	95	3.0	195	2.6	361	1.7
Auto theft.....	71	2.9	30	2.1	42	1.9
Rape.....	28	11.3	31	9.1	29	8.9

¹ Includes 2 life sentences, computed at 45 years.

² Includes 7 life sentences, computed at 45 years.

³ Includes 1 life sentence, computed at 45 years.

Data from Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D. C., Apr. 1, 1955.

Rigid Farm Supports Result in Lower Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pledged to support any program that will improve our farm economy, short of outright grants from the public treasury, but I remain unpersuaded that 90 percent of parity can accomplish that end. In fact, the direct opposite has been the result, and we know that farm prices dropped some 22 points while rigid supports were in full force and effect. I also believe that our overall economy can best be improved by a reduction in the cost of government with a consequent reduction in taxes. The Agriculture Act of 1954 and the revision of our Federal tax laws, both of which were enacted during the Republican-controlled 83d Congress, will in my opinion operate to the improvement of our economy through the stabilization of farm prices and the retention by all of our citizens, through tax reductions, of more of their earnings for their own use. The following letter from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson addressed to Mr. J. Claude Hammond of Gettysburg, Pa., explores these views and is included with these remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 5, 1955.

Mr. J. CLAUDE HAMMOND,
Gettysburg, Pa.,

DEAR Mr. HAMMOND: Your letter of February 26 addressed to President Eisenhower has been referred to me for reply. I want to say first that I deeply regret the difficulties in which you find yourself as a result of the adjustments that have to be made in this transition period from one of war to one of peace. These adjustments are particularly hard for agriculture because as we move into a peacetime economy prices for the things the farmer has to sell are the first to adjust to peacetime levels. This is true this time as has always been the case in the past. However, this administration takes pride in the fact that the adjustments that have had to be made in agriculture have not been anywhere near as difficult as those that farmers experienced following the First World War, or the Second, or in fact any other war in our history. This lessening of the impact has been brought about through careful management of our Federal affairs including those of agriculture.

I think you will be interested to know that total agricultural assets stood at \$162 billion at the beginning of 1955, up slightly over a year earlier. Farm debt, as a percentage of current assets was 23.9 percent on January 1, 1955, compared with 49.3 percent in 1940 and 70.4 percent in 1930. Following World War I, farmland values fell nearly 20 percent below the 1920 peak in 2 years. From the post-World War II peak reached in 1952, farmland values had declines less than 4 percent by January 1, 1955.

The parity ratio, which measures price received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services, has been relatively stable during the past year. It dropped from a Korean war peak of 113 percent in February 1951, to 94 percent in January 1953. Since then it has averaged about 90

percent. Currently it is 87 percent. Thus nearly three-fourths of the decline in farm prices came in the 2 years before this administration took office. All of the decline occurred while we had rigid supports at 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities. The flexible price support provisions of the Agricultural act of 1954 do not become effective until the 1955 harvests.

Since dairy price supports were reduced from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent on April 1, 1954, there has been real improvement in the dairy situation. Consumption is up. Milk production has leveled off. Government purchases of dairy products are sharply down. Surplus stocks are moving into use. In recent months dairymen have been receiving from 84 to 86 percent of parity for all milk—approximately the same as in March 1954 when 90-percent supports were still in effect.

The second part of your letter deals with the tax legislation of the last Congress. First, let me say that everyone agreed—Democrats and Republicans alike—as to the need for a general revision of our Federal tax laws. Such a revision was long overdue. Second, the tax reduction of our administration was unparalleled in the life of our Nation, totaling \$7,400,000,000. This is hard to grasp, but the money the American farmers got last year for all the corn and all the wheat grown in our entire country was \$7 billion. This reduction was made possible through careful elimination of wasteful, duplicating, and often ridiculous spending policies of the big Government operation built by the Democrats. Of the total of \$7,400,000,000 in tax savings brought about by Republican policies, nearly two-thirds, or \$4,700,000,000, goes directly into the pockets of the wage earner and the family and other individuals. This meant a saving for the average American family—a taxpaying family of 4—of \$200 a year.

This 900-page Republican law containing some 3,000 independent tax-law changes contains a long list of benefits to the low-income taxpayer, such as additional child dependency, deduction of tax credit on retirement income, extension of split-income provisions to widows and widowers with children, lowers medical-expense deductions requirements, gives working widows, widowers, and mothers a tax reduction, liberalizes soil-conservation expense allowances for farmers, permits additional allowances for charitable contributions, and a long list of other low-income benefits.

In short, the largest tax saving in history has been handed to the American people—not to any one group but to all—and, it seems to me, that is the American way.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON, Secretary.

A Vote of Thanks to Dr. Jonas E. Salk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in Congress a concurrent resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to Dr. Jonas E. Salk for his great achievement in developing an antipolio vaccine.

We all owe this brilliant young scientist a heartfelt vote of thanks, and it is fitting that the elected representatives

of all the people should offer a word of sincere commendation in behalf of the American people.

This historic contribution to preventive medicine proves again that America leads the world in the development of weapons to save human life and we freely share with the world the noble humanitarian benefits of our greatest scientific achievements.

Dr. Salk, the son of a garment worker, is an example of how an American boy in our great land of free enterprise can achieve success and attain the highest honors.

I wish to add that I am deeply gratified that United States Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele is taking immediate steps to extend the facilities of the United States Public Health Service in distributing the new polio vaccine.

Forest Conservation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, with increasing frequency our valuable national forest lands are being nibbled to death by "weekend miners" who have been using the Nation's mining laws to lay claim to valuable stands of timber and choice summer home sites.

These "weekend" miners are not to be confused with the legitimate prospector upon whose optimism, energy and ability the future wealth and safety of our Nation depends. The legitimate miner presents no problem. His diggings—if he is fortunate to find an ore body—are few and far between and present no hazard to our forest watershed areas.

The minority, however, that are abusing the law have in their capacity created a national scandal.

The problem of correcting this situation has not been easy to solve. The legitimate prospector and miner understandably objected to changes in the mining law that would, in preventing abuses, put him out of business also. The forest service, commendably zealous, had difficulty in recognizing this fact.

Now, however, after lengthy meetings legislation has been drafted and I have introduced it today in the House. This legislation has the strong support of both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

The new legislation recognizes the requirements of the legitimate miner and prospector but it also will bring to a halt the abuses of the mining laws who seek to obtain areas of the public domain for nonmining purposes.

Briefly, the new legislation would:

First. Ban the location of mining claims for common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and make them subject to disposal by the United States under terms of the Materials Disposal Act.

Second. As to mining claims hereafter located, it would, prior to patent:

(a) Prohibit use of the mining claims for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities.

(b) Authorize the Federal Government to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage the other surface resources—except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws—and to use the surface of the claim for these purposes or for access to adjacent land, without endangering or materially interfering with mining operations or related activities.

(c) Bar the mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources except to the extent required for mining or related activities. Any timber cutting by the mining claimant, other than that to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

Third. Provide an in rem procedure, similar to a "quiet-title" action, under which the Federal Government could expeditiously resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment of this measure, in any given area.

This legislation is fair and long overdue. I urge Members to study it and to press for its speedy passage by Congress.

NACA 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Federal agency responsible for fundamental, scientific aeronautical research in the United States, is observing its 40th anniversary. I should like to express felicitations. I should like also to wish that in the years ahead the NACA may continue to provide the essential foundation of information upon which our continued aerial supremacy must rest.

I should like to speak briefly about the oldest and largest of the research centers which the NACA operates. It is the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, located at Langley Field near Hampton in the First District of Virginia which I am honored to represent.

During its first year, 1915, the NACA was little more than what its name implies, an advisory committee. Composed at the time of 12 members instead of 17 as at present, the NACA promptly decided that if the United States, the birthplace of the airplane, was to regain its lead in aeronautics, intensified research activity was imperative. Within its first year, the NACA had taken the beginning steps to acquire such needed research equipment, and before 1916 had ended, the site now known as Langley Field was chosen.

What a proud name for an aeronautical institution to bear—in honor of Samuel Pierpont Langley. Even before 1889 when Professor Langley went to the Smithsonian Institution, that national repository of historic treasures, he had undertaken trailblazing in the infant science of aeronautics. He continued his aeronautical experimentation, and by 1896 he had flown large, powered airplane models for distances of more than half-a-mile. His standing in the scientific community gave encouragement to many, including Wilbur and Orville Wright, to undertake aeronautical experimentation. Following two accidents late in 1903, his own work was ridiculed. But his failures do not detract from his greatness.

The NACA's first wind tunnel, located at the Langley Laboratory was in today's terms, very small. But it, and the equipment that was soon built, were used so effectively that by the late twenties, the technical journals of Europe were conceding that the work at Langley Field had placed the United States in the forefront of aeronautics. In the years since, our continued aerial supremacy has, no less, been due to the work of the NACA.

It is the paid staff of the NACA, the scientists and the other workers, whom we should salute as being so largely responsible for American leadership in the air. Until 1939, the Langley Laboratory was the only research establishment the NACA operated. The laboratories and field stations constructed since were given a good start by top men being sent from Langley to head them up.

I wish time permitted my naming every one of the men and women at Langley. Instead, I must be content to mention but two:

First, the director of the Langley Laboratory, Henry J. E. Reid. With the NACA since 1921, he was only 25 when he was named head of the scientific staff at the Laboratory. Over the years, Dr. Reid's splendid work as administrator of the Langley Laboratory has become a model for others who would encourage highly trained young men to become the competent researchers so urgently needed.

Second, John Stack, now assistant director at the Langley Laboratory. In 1947 he was a co-winner of the Collier trophy, aviation's premier trophy. This was for his conception of the high-speed research airplane program which resulted in the first supersonic flight. In 1951 Mr. Stack was again a Collier trophy winner, this time for the work he and his associates did in conceiving, developing, and applying practically, the transonic wind-tunnel throat. I am no scientist, but I have been informed that this development—the transonic wind tunnel—has provided the United States with a research tool of utmost value in the design and production of tactical supersonic airplanes.

Today, the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory of the NACA has more than 3,000 scientists and supporting personnel working intensively on all manner of aeronautical problems. For example, those having to do with enabling our new military aircraft to fly at ever faster supersonic speeds; those which must be

solved before the true intercontinental ballistic missile will have become an actuality; in hydrodynamics, making flying boats equally efficient at near supersonic speeds and while floating upon the uneasy waters of the seven seas; in structures, learning how to construct airplanes that will be stronger and yet lighter and safer.

All this, involving the use of giant wind tunnels and other research tools so complex as to make description difficult—all this has been possible because succeeding Congresses have authorized the necessary new construction and have appropriated the funds needed to make fruitful use of that new equipment.

Today, as I salute the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and speak briefly of the important role Virginia's Langley Aeronautical Laboratory has played in achieving aerial supremacy, I pray that in Congress we may continue to have the wisdom to provide adequate support for this essential Government activity.

Address by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway,
Chief of Staff, United States Army, to
the West Point Society of New York
at the Annual Founders Day Dinner,
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City,
March 19, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include a splendid address made by a great military leader and great American, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, on March 19, 1955, to the West Point Society of New York at the annual founders day dinner held in New York City.

The views of General Ridgway are worthy of profound consideration in connection with our national defense, and particularly in connection with the strength of our Army during these trying days. In addition to showing that the "land arm" is indispensable in seizing, holding, and controlling portions of the world's surface, he also makes the pointed assertion that—

It is, I believe, indisputably true that weakness in the strength of ground forces anywhere in the free world invites aggression in those areas. Where free-world ground forces are in position in strength, conditions tend toward stability, and the chance of successful aggression lessens.

Also, the further pointed statement:

By remaining strong militarily, and by taking full advantage of our Nation's human, industrial, and scientific potential, we can best hope to deter aggression, or, should it occur, to deal with it in the manner that our national interests require. As a decisive factor in war, there is no substitute for

determined troops, adequately trained, properly armed with modern weapons, well led, and imbued with the will to close with the enemy on the ground and crush him. I believe any contrary concept is a dangerous fallacy.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Baruch, General Byran, distinguished guests, and members of the West Point Society of New York, it is an honor to be one of this gathering tonight, an honor to share once more in honoring our illustrious alma mater, an honor to be permitted to address this group of eminent Americans and sons of West Point, whose high achievements and dedicated service to God and country, in peace and war, testify eloquently to the worth of West Point's teachings, and to its continuing contributions to the Nation's progress.

Let us first recall with reverent pride the many sons of the United States Military Academy who have given life or limb in battle, defending with unswerving loyalty the values and ideals which inspire the people of our Nation. Let us, too, express our abiding appreciation to West Point's sons, who are serving the Nation in our Armed Forces and in civil life, alongside of their patriotic fellow Americans whose service equally elicits our admiration.

Ninety years ago a great human drama was closing—a great historical era in our evolving society was about to begin.

Early in April of that year of 1865, two men of high principle faced each other in that climactic scene at Appomattox. They were famous then. They were to attain still higher eminence. Yet, in spite of the greatness Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee achieved in later years, perhaps neither ever knew more greatness of soul than that to which adherence to their principles had elevated them at that moment.

I seem to discern, in the perspective in which time now brings those war years and that scene into focus, a parallel with the American scene today. Not since then, I think, has destiny confronted America with such decisions. Not since then has principle stood so revealed as the instrument by which our future shall be decided.

Then, as now, apathy and complacency dragged at the feet of principle, and the search for a less arduous path threatened to sap national resolution. Today, fateful decisions, as in those days, confront our Nation, and the paths which we as a people choose to follow, will no less vitally affect our future before God and man.

We live in an age when science and technology appear to challenge the capabilities of man to control the fruits of his own rapidly increasing knowledge. To the normal hazards of life, as we have known it, there has been added in recent years the power of modern weapons, with destructive capability on an almost unimaginable scale, the magnitude of which goes on increasing—and with it the number and magnitude of the problems we confront.

There can be no dodging these problems, no escaping our national destiny for decisions, no evading our responsibility as a people for the results which will flow from their execution.

These results can have such a staggering impact in future years that I think it pertinent to discuss one or two of them briefly, even if this introduces a somewhat somber note into this pleasant evening. Most of us are members of the active Army. As such, we may well review what the Army's role is expected to be, and how it and we can discharge that role to our country's best advantage, in our evolving destiny.

I think no mind, however fine, can perceive with any sureness the course of events beyond the immediate future. Yet we may be sure that there will be continuing danger

of war, while there exists the present combination of implacable hostility toward us by Kremlin leadership, and a great and growing capability under its control for military aggression and political subversion.

So long as this combination exists, the risk of war will remain, in spite of all we do to seek by all honorable means, to prevent war's occurrence. This risk has become an accepted fact in our daily life. We must reduce this risk of war, not ignore it, and we can, if we resolutely maintain our determination to remain strong at all costs, and to take the measures necessary for our protection, while with the dynamic force of faith we renew and intensify our efforts to solve this greatest of all problems—the preservation of peace and the extension of freedom.

Weapons of mass destruction are a two-edged sword. Under our control, they may serve as a deterrent to aggression. In the hands of the Communists they pose a threat. But they are still weapons, with definite limitations as well as capabilities, and subject, like all weapons, to man's control. The United States Army is prepared to employ tactically an impressive family of modern weapons against legitimate military targets.

Until some major change occurs in the world power ratio, and none is yet discernible on the international horizon, I firmly believe we must continue to employ our industrial and technical resources in ways most likely to increase our national security; that we must maintain, and to the maximum practicable extent, increase our superiority in all these modern weapons, atomic, and otherwise; that we must preserve adequate strength in all our Armed Forces, properly proportioned between the land, sea, and air arms.

The Army has inherent military characteristics indispensable in warfare, capabilities which we are ceaselessly seeking to increase. First in importance is the capability of the land arm to seize, hold, and control portions of the earth's surface, and the people who inhabit them. No other service has that capability. It is significant that in many instances where Communist aggression has occurred in the world, Communist ground forces have been the principal instruments of aggression, and that where aggression has been halted and defeated, this has been accomplished mainly by ground forces, with supporting sea and air strength.

It is, I believe, indisputably true that weakness in the strength of ground forces anywhere in the free world invites aggression in those areas. Where free world ground forces are in a position in strength, conditions tend toward stability and the chance of successful aggression lessens.

By remaining strong militarily and by taking full advantage of our Nation's human, industrial, and scientific potential, we can best hope to deter aggression, or, should it occur, to deal with it in the manner that our national interests require. As a decisive factor in war, there is no substitute for determined troops, adequately trained, properly armed with modern weapons, well led, and imbued with the will to close with the enemy on the ground and crush him. I believe any contrary concept is a dangerous fallacy.

Since, in the final analysis, man is the most important element in war, the intangibles that inspire men—the great moral and spiritual influences—are of the utmost importance in deciding issues between warring groups. An army's success in modern war will depend upon its possession of the highest attributes of bravery, patriotism, professional skill, and devotion to duty. The soldier in combat will be placed under the severest stresses to which war has yet subjected him. He will need and must receive the highest type of leadership and that type of leadership the Army will provide.

We can take deep pride in our officer corps and our noncommissioned officer corps—two

reservoirs of leaders of character and competence, highly trained, many tested in combat, imbued with confidence, and sustained by those principles which have made our alma mater and our Nation great.

Today these leaders bear, and in the years ahead their successors will bear, heavy responsibilities. The manner in which they are discharged will be of incalculable importance to us and to mankind. If, in reaching decisions which lie ahead, our Nation remains true to the principles of the Founding Fathers; if our Nation matches the dedication to principle exemplified by the victor and the vanquished at Appomattox; then we need have no fear of future trials. For the principles on which our country is founded are rocks, and like the heights of the Hudson at West Point, they are the hills unto which we lift up our eyes, for from them, in truth, will come our help.

Youthful Energies and the Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, at this time of year when life begins to stir and tree buds burst, many men in their early forties recall how they once lived and worked in a CCC camp. They recall the depression of the early thirties when they were left with nothing to do—and nothing to do it with. These thoughts come to them because just 22 years ago this month, the first CCC camp was established on the George Washington National Forest in nearby Virginia. It was appropriately called Camp Roosevelt in honor of a great President whose quick action in approving the Emergency Conservation Act helped relieve unemployment by putting men to work on the national forests, the national parks, and others of our public lands.

During nearly 9 years after the act of March 31, 1933, was signed, the people of every State saw young men standing in line to enroll in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Before the camps were closed in 1942 there were over 2,600 such camps in which over 3 million young men had seized the opportunity to build self-confidence while serving their country. I know what it meant, for I was with them.

Like thousands in those days, when I graduated from the Winona State Teachers College in my State, I stood with a diploma in my hand and no place to use my training. The CCC looked good, and believe me, it was good to me. For the better part of 2 years I worked with other young men on the Superior National Forest in northeastern Minnesota as camp educational adviser. The tasks we did depended upon the time of year and the ingenuity of our camp superintendent. We planted trees and built roads, strung telephone wires, searched for the elusive gooseberry bush to free the white pine trees from blister

rust, and fought forest fires. As camp educational adviser it was my task to provide educational opportunities in addition to the relief and work programs for which the CCC is more widely known. We worked in warm weather and in cold. There was plenty to do, but we were young. We liked the work; we liked the life; and especially, we liked the opportunity to be a recognized part of American life.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1955

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a divine covenant, quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we shall be its living witness and inspire freemen toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise and dangers of a new age.

O Thou who hast led us out of bondage with a vision of man's righteousness, Thou who hast taught us that we are faithful to Thee only when we labor for Thy children, guide us in our deliberations so that we shall find the path that leads upward, the way that builds new strength and new hope for the children of men.

Bless Thou the men who raise Thy standards in our time, the men who guard the rights of their fellow men, the men who are not neutral in time of evil, the men who do not turn away their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for the mess of pottage of petty gain, the men who have the self-discipline of the disciples of Thy sacred law as children of a just God.

Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that through our labors in this great moment of history we shall in truth be the living witness of Thy covenant, and the time will soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ELLENDER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. DOUGLAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

I believe I am the only Member of this Congress who was in the CCC. From this vantage point, I see it as a great movement to renew a spirit of adventure in youth, and to dramatize the protection and restoration of our natural resources. Our efforts up there on the shores of Lake Superior stand out as part of a job being done by thousands of young men in hundreds of CCC camps across the country.

Journal of Thursday, April 14, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate commencing at 4:30 p. m. today, and for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. DOUGLAS, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, during the sessions of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Because of our work, millions of acres of forest land now yield crops of pulpwood and sawlogs, on millions more, fat livestock feed on good grass that we made possible, everywhere sportsmen find better places in which to fish and hunt, and families have places where they may picnic. Now, as never before, I see in the CCC, an evidence of what can be done when direction is given to the energies of youth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LIST OF PRINCIPAL AND ALTERNATE CANDIDATES SELECTED FOR 1955 REGULAR NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1955 Regular Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program (with an accompanying list); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXEMPTION FOR DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM PAYMENT OF CERTAIN TAXES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7511 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide exemption for diplomatic officers and employees from payment of internal revenue taxes on imported articles (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ENTITLED "USE AND DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY" BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission entitled "Use and Disposal of Surplus Property" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract within Acadia National Park, Maine (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, TENNESSEE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit, in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tennessee (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF DIVISION OF COAL MINE INSPECTION, BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on synthetic liquid fuels, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on